

New York State Education Department

2023-2024 Renewal Site Visit Report for Board of Regents-Authorized Charter Schools under the 2015 Charter School Performance Framework

Academy of Health Sciences Charter School

Renewal Site Visit Dates: October 24-25, 2023 Date of Final Draft Site Visit Report: April 18, 2024 Date of Final Site Visit Report: May 3, 2024

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

Table of Contents

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION	3
METHODOLOGY	4
BENCHMARK ANALYSIS	6
Summary of Findings	
Benchmark 1: Student Performance	9
BENCHMARK 2: TEACHING AND LEARNING	
BENCHMARK 3: CULTURE, CLIMATE, AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT	
BENCHMARK 4: FINANCIAL CONDITION	
BENCHMARK 5: FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	17
BENCHMARK 6: BOARD OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNANCE	
BENCHMARK 7: ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY	20
BENCHMARK 8: MISSION AND KEY DESIGN ELEMENTS	
Benchmark 9: Enrollment, Recruitment, and Retention	25
BENCHMARK 10: LEGAL COMPLIANCE	

ATTACHMENT 1: 2024 NYSED CHARTER SCHOOL INFORMATION DASHBOARD

ATTACHMENT 2: 2023 CHARTER SCHOOL FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY DASHBOARD

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

Charter School Summary¹

Name of Charter School	Academy of Health Sciences Charter School
	Warren Hern
Board Chair	
District of Location	Rochester City School District (RCSD)
Initial Commencement of Instruction	Fall 2019
Charter Term	Initial Charter: August 19, 2019 - June 30, 2024
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	Grades 5-8 / 450 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	Grades 5-8 / 450 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	None
Facilities	1151 Ridgeway Avenue, Rochester, New York 14615 - Private Space
Mission Statement	The mission of Academy of Health Sciences Charter School (AHS) is to provide a supportive learning environment focused on academic achievement in preparation for college, careers, and lives of service in the health sciences.
Key Design Elements	 Culture of collective efficacy College and career readiness Middle school preparation starting in Grade 5 Data and student-driven instruction Effective teaching strategies Extended and enhanced learning Positive school culture
Requested Revisions (Revisions are not approved unless approved by the Board of Regents.)	None

Innovative and Noteworthy Programs: Academy of Health Sciences Charter School (AHS) identifies an area of innovation for middle school preparation. Students enter at fifth grade with significant gaps between their academic proficiency levels and grade level expectations. To address this, the school prioritizes a positive school culture, data and student-driven decision making, and effective teaching strategies, all targeting closure of the academic gap by the end of eighth grade.

Renewal Outcomes: Reference the Board of Regents Renewal Policy.

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

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

	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	Grade 5	Grades 5 - 6	Grades 5 - 7	Grades 5 - 8	Grades 5 - 8
Total Approved Enrollment	100	200	300	425	450

Current Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

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

	Year 1 2024 to 2025	Year 2 2025 to 2026	Year 3 2026 to 2027	Year 4 2027 to 2028	Year 5 2028 to 2029
Grade Configuration	Grades 5 - 8				
Total Proposed Enrollment	450	450	450	450	450

METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Renewal Report

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

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

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

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

as well as a commitment to the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion, in the school's policies and practices.

A two-day renewal site visit was conducted at the Academy of Health Sciences Charter School (AHS) on October 24 and 25, 2023. The New York State Education Department's Charter School Office (CSO) team conducted interviews with the board of trustees, the school leadership team, the student support team, and teachers.

The team conducted 23 classroom observations in Grades 5, 6, 7, and 8. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length and conducted jointly with either the principal, assistant principal, ELA coach, math coach, or the student support manager. NYSED utilizes the CSO's Classroom Observation Worksheet as a lens for classroom observations. It is shared with the school prior to the site visit, and can be found in the 2023-2024 <u>Renewal SV Protocol</u>.

To draft this report, the CSO site visit team reviewed school-specific documents and data such as the school's 2023-2024 renewal application, 2022-2023 annual report, surveys, data and fiscal dashboards, CSO site visit reports and memos, and complaints.

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

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

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

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

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

New York State Education Department 2015 Charter School Performance Framework Rating³

	2015 Performance Benchmark	Level
	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
Educational Success	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.	Meets
Edu	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
	Benchmark 4: Financial Condition: The school is in sound and stable financial condition as evidenced by performance on key financial indicators.	Meets
oundness	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
Organizational Soundness	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.	
Organ	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.	
to	Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements: The school is faithful to its mission and has implemented the key design elements included in its charter.	Approaches
Faithfulness to Charter & Law	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.	Meets

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

Summary of Findings

- AHS is in year five of operation and serves students in Grades 5-8. During its current charter term, the school is rated in the following manner: meeting seven benchmarks, approaching two benchmarks, and falling far below one benchmark. A summary of those ratings is provided below.
- Summary of Areas of Growth and Strengths: AHS uses a standards-based assessment system that
 communicates specific levels of mastery for each standard to teachers, students, and families. A
 new report card format, a goal setting template, and information sessions for parents have been
 completed. AHS has a resource room program with four special education teachers to support
 and increase the recruitment of students with disabilities (SWD). It also has an English language
 learner (ELL) teacher to support ELL students and enhance recruitment efforts for ELL students.
 The board of trustees has had consistent membership, and it makes good use of its committee
 structure. Likewise, the school leadership structure is appropriate for the size and nature of the
 student body, providing academic, behavioral, and social emotional support.
- Summary of Challenges: The school's academic achievement, while above RCSD, is well below NYS and needs to be improved. AHS confronts a significant challenge in maintaining an adequate proportion of SWD and ELL students. AHS has identified several action steps to address this challenge. The school leaders believe that the opening of a new building and implementation of a comprehensive marketing strategy will help significantly in meeting this challenge. AHS is not fully or partially implementing all of its key design elements. Details of the status of each are in Benchmark 8.

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

Over the term of this charter, the trajectory for this benchmark has changed from not being able to be assessed at the time the 2022 midterm site visit report was issued to an Approaches due to low overall academic achievement.

The 2023 NYSTP 3-8 Assessments for ELA and math was the second year of participation for the school, and while some improvement was seen (ELA was 23 percent proficient and went up to 28 percent; math was 11 percent proficient and went up to 17 percent) and the school does outperform the district of location (DOL), RCSD, the differentials for both ELA and math to NYS are -21 percentage points and -32, respectively.

See Attachment 1 for data tables and additional academic information.

Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning

School leaders have systems in place designed to cultivate shared accountability and high expectations and that lead to students' well-being, improved academic outcomes, and educational success. The school has rigorous and coherent curriculum and assessments that are aligned to the New York State Learning Standards (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: Meets

	<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
		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.
1.	Curriculum	c. The curriculum is aligned horizontally across classrooms at the same grade level and vertically between grades.
		 d. The curriculum is differentiated to provide opportunities for all students to master grade-level skills and concepts. e. The curriculum is systematically reviewed and revised.
		a. The school staff has a common understanding of high-quality instruction, and
2.	Instruction	observed instructional practices align to this understanding.
		b. Instructional delivery fosters engagement with all students.
-	assessment and	a. The school uses a balanced system of formative, diagnostic and summative assessments.
<i>З.</i>		b. The school uses qualitative and quantitative data to inform instruction and improve student outcomes.
_	Evaluation	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.

Academic Program for Middle School:

- MS
 - ELA: The iReady curriculum, with units designed by teachers with quality and diverse texts for content knowledge as well as literary exposure.
 - Math: The iReady curriculum.
 - Science: Next Generation Science Standards; Grades 7 and 8 add resources form OpenSciEd.
 - $\circ~$ Social Studies: Units draw from a variety of primary sources aligned to New York State standards.

Academic Program for SWD and ELL:

- SWD:
 - AHS offers instructional settings and ancillary services to fulfill students' IEP mandates. These setting/service models include special education teacher support services (SETSS), an integrated co-taught classroom (ICT) at each grade level, and district-provided services for occupational, physical, and speech therapy as needed.
 - AHS endeavors to offer services in the least restrictive and inclusive settings. The aim is to remain consistent with the mission of the NYSED Office of Special Education to ensure access to high-quality instruction, teaching to the same standards as all other students, and leaving AHS students prepared to continue learning.
- ELL:
 - AHS uses standard screening procedures for identifying ELL. A Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) is used to instruct ELL students.
 - The school provides instruction for ELL students in both general and specialized educational settings. A certified ELL teacher manages the program and ensures that no student is denied access to equal education because of the language spoken at home.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 2:

Over the term of this charter, the trajectory for this benchmark has remained as a Meets.

- 1. Element: *Curriculum*:
 - Indicator a: Documents and site visits confirm that AHS uses a standard-based curriculum
 intended to align with a standards-based assessment system. The school reports that it is the
 alignment to NY Next Generation Standards that drives rigor of instruction with revisions and
 enhancements done during the school year by teaching teams with the help of coaches. The
 school also conducts a summer work session in which the curriculum is aligned vertically and
 revised.
 - Indicator b: Elements of themes and concepts that are complex and make higher order thinking possible were evident during classroom visits. In two of the classes observed, students were working in groups discussing the concepts being taught. Other classes were found to be working at different stages of instruction such as direct instruction, guided work, classroom presentations, and independent work.
 - Indicator c: Teachers report that horizontal alignment is ensured by teams' planning sessions. This is done by aligning instruction with standards and a common understanding of elements of mastery in learning. Instructional coaches facilitate vertical alignment as they work with the different grade-level teams.

- Indicator d: The approach to differentiation is based on using the same understanding of concept mastery for all students and differentiated activities according to different students' needs. Teachers report that decisions in the differentiation of instructions are helped by coaches and consulting with special education support teachers. No overt examples of differentiated instruction were evident during classroom visits.
- **Indicator e:** During the renewal visit, instructional coaches stated that analysis of rigor based on standards is an integral part of their work. The school also conducts a summer work session in which curriculum revision and alignment take place. The teacher focus group members reported that curriculum revision is done routinely by grade level teams.
- 2. Element: Instruction:
 - Indicator a: Some classrooms demonstrated evidence of rigor in the curriculum, as well as a shared understanding of mastery of concepts. The Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) framework referenced in the renewal application is more difficult to observe during visits.
 - Indicator b: The CSO site visit team observed student engagement in all classes. Students followed directions and engaged in learning with an understanding of the concepts being taught. A variety of groupings from whole class to cooperative work to individual work was used. Teachers frequently checked for understanding. The use of these strategies supported student engagement at the school.

3. Element: Assessment and Program Evaluations:

- Indicator a: The school uses a system of standards-based assessments which measure growth toward mastery. It uses formative, pre- (diagnostic), and post- (prognostic) assessments to gauge achievement. Items for school-developed assessments are selected according to their alignment with State standards. The school employs a data specialist whose role is to analyze and present data to school leaders and coaches in a way that informs instruction.
- Indicator b: Leaders, coaches, and the data facilitator help teachers more effectively understand how to improve instruction. Using the LinkedIn platform supports improved instruction as the platform is specifically aligned to State standards. Teachers use weekly and daily checks for understanding. They receive coaching on using qualitative and quantitative data yielded by assessments to improve outcomes.
- Indicator c: AHS develops a comprehensive dashboard of qualitative and quantitative data that allows leaders and board members to evaluate the quality of the academic program. This tool is used by policy and practice decision-makers in determining overall program effectiveness and the need for changes in the academic program.

4. Element: Supports for Diverse Learners:

- Indicator a: The school provides support to teachers in meeting the academic needs of SWD and ELL through coaching and student-focused instructional support from the four grade-level special education teachers and a certified ELL teacher. In addition, the teacher focus group members indicated that coaches have helped identify student needs regarding academic gaps and materials appropriate to teaching learning standards to all students. These materials, according to the teacher focus group, are also relevant to student interests.
- Indicator b: Coaches, with the help of the data specialist, assist all teachers in monitoring the performance of groups as well as that of individual students. This includes interventionist teachers. This results in involving all teachers in the analysis as well as communication among specialists and other teachers.

Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate, and Family Engagement

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

Finding: Meets

	<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
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. The school communicates with and engages families with the school community. b. Teachers communicate with parents to discuss students' strengths and needs. c. The school assesses family and student satisfaction using strategies such as surveys, feedback sessions, community forums, or participation logs, and considers results when making schoolwide decisions. d. The school has a systematic process for responding to family or community concerns. e. The school shares school-level academic data with the broader school community to promote transparency and accountability among parents, students and school constituents.
3.	Social-Emotional Supports	 a. The school has systems or programs in place to support the social-emotional needs of students. b. School leaders collect and use data to track the socio-emotional needs of students. c. School leaders collect and use data regarding the impact of programs designed to support students' social and emotional health.

Over the term of this charter, the trajectory for this benchmark has improved from an Approaches to a Meets due to consistent adherence to behavioral expectations by all staff and a shift toward restorative practices.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 3:

- 1. Element: *Behavior Management and Safety:*
 - Indicator a: AHS has a well-developed, clear, and consistent discipline policy. The board of trustees revised the discipline policy in August of 2023. The policy includes an approach that includes opportunities for students to readdress their behavior, progressive discipline, consequences in the context of the behavior, restorative practices, and prompt return to instruction.
 - Indicator b: The consistent application of an effective system of student behavior and a safe environment is markedly overt at the very minute the observer enters AHS. This was true throughout all classrooms, corridors, the cafeteria, and the gymnasium. All observations revealed consistent, orderly behavior. All teachers observed used the same practices and language in dealing with disruptive behaviors, preventing possible disruptions, and recognizing positive comportment. All staff members were able to explain the tenets of the AHS approach to discipline without hesitation.
 - Indicator c: School leaders confirmed that the school has a number of staff members who are responsible for dealing with and preventing instances of harassment or discrimination. Deans of students were able to speak to the declining number of incidents.
 - Indicator d: All classrooms observed were devoid of interruptions. The teacher focus group members stated that the efficacy of the discipline policy allows them more time to focus on instruction. Leaders stated that their aim in creating a highly efficient discipline approach is to provide classrooms that are more conducive to learning.

2. Element: Family Engagement and Communication:

- Indicator a: School leaders told the CSO site visit team that they recognize an immediate need to communicate with parents and elicit their support. This need relates to the fact that students entering AHS from the district perform at one to two years below their grade. Strategies for parent engagement include visits and "empowerment nights," described below. The school has also used Zoom meetings with groups of parents. The academic focus of these initial communications resulted in academic topics being used more often than disciplinary problems when teachers communicate with parents.
- Indicator b: An important way in which teachers communicate with parents is through the Empowerment Growth Reports. The way these reports are created and disseminated is what makes them powerful for family engagement. The process starts with teachers presenting the data to each student and agreeing to individual, measurable goals for improvement. The school then uses student-centered family conferences to convey the information to families. The fact that the student is presenting makes for high family attendance and, subsequently, continuous engagement. A family advisory group is in place and the board added a parent trustee to its composition. Both initiatives demonstrate that parent engagement and communication are high priorities.
- Indicator c: The school's information system provides easy access to parent contact information. The system also allows for easy logging of any call. In addition to conference nights, teachers often communicate directly with parents. Some staff members, such as deans of students, constantly communicate with parents as part of their job responsibilities. The school's leadership reports that the vast majority of these calls are made in support of students' academic and/or behavioral successes.

- Indicator d: Neither the renewal application nor the mid-term report contains a description of a system used in responding to parents and/or community concerns. The question was not specifically asked during the renewal visit. The Charter School Office has received only a handful of informal complaints over the charter term. These complaints never became formal and, once referred to school administration, were addressed quickly and satisfactorily.
- **Indicator e:** AHS shares the school's academic data openly by publishing NYSED's annual reports on its easily accessible website. Some articles in the website's NEWS category inform the public of distinct items of information related to academic achievement.

3. Element: *Social-Emotional Supports*:

- Indicator a: The school uses the first block of the day, the Advisory Block, to engage in direct instruction that supports a healthy socio-emotional environment. The advisory starts with a five-minute mindfulness exercise from Roboot© and continues with the Second Step© curriculum. The assistant principals, the student support manager, the deans of students, and the school counselor work in coordination to address the socio-emotional needs of students. Teachers access support for their students via the multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) used at AHS. Teachers also participate in supporting students' socio-emotional needs through the implementation of strategies learned through coaching and training conducted by the assistant principals and deans of students.
- Indicator b: The deans of students collect most of the data on the socio-emotional well-being of students and refer this data to the administration for analysis. Teacher focus group members agreed that AHS pays attention to the socio-emotional needs of students and collects data as part of the supporting process.
- Indicator c: The leadership team reports using collected data to evaluate the number of programs used to support students' socio-emotional health. It is difficult to determine the efficacy of one isolated and specific program among several that are used in combination. Leaders have made decisions on individual program emphasis by looking at the overall improvements demonstrated by the data.

Benchmark 4: Financial Condition

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

Finding: Meets

Over the term of this charter, the trajectory for this benchmark has remained as a Meets.

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

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

Financial Condition

Academy of Health Sciences Charter School appears to be in good financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school's independently audited financial statements.

Overall Financial Outlook

A financial composite score is an overall measure of financial health based on a weighting of primary reserves, equity, and net income. A charter school with a score between 1.50 and 3.00 is generally considered to be in good financial health. Academy of Health Sciences Charter School's 2022-2023 composite score is 2.15.

2019-2020 to 2022-2023				
Year	Composite Score			
2019-2020	2.65			
2020-2021	3.00			
2021-2022	3.00			
2022-2023	2.15			

Composite Scores 2019-2020 to 2022-2023

Benchmark 5: Financial Management

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

Finding: Meets

Over the term of this charter, the trajectory for this benchmark has remained as a 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 absences of a going concern disclosure.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 5:

NYSED CSO reviewed Academy of Health Sciences Charter School's 2022-2023 audited financial statements to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses.

Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance

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

Finding: Meets

	<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
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.

Over the term of this charter, the trajectory for this benchmark has remained as a Meets.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 6:

Element: Board Oversight and Governance:

- Indicator a: The school's board has been a consistent group since its founding. The current composition includes expertise in development, finance, health sciences, education, research, public policy, real estate, and human resources. One of its members serves as a parent trustee. The board also has a non-member advisor in the area of finance. It conducts an annual self-evaluation, administered by the governance committee, each spring. AHS board has a clearly defined committee structure and holds annual retreats in which committees give an in-depth review of their work. An independent facilitator guides the retreats. The board has created a relevant data dashboard that focuses on the most relevant governance tasks and data.
- Indicator b: The committee structure is key to efficient oversight of the charter school management. Current committees include the executive committee, finance and audit committee governance committee, academic committee, infrastructure committee, and development committee. Committees, with board approval, can include non-board advisors in their work. The finance committee has several members who have related expertise. For example, the school's accounting firm is represented on the finance committee. Several trustees have financial and management oversight experience due to their participation on other boards. The trustees have helped the administration create a data dashboard that focuses on the most important school governance areas.

- Indicator c: The AHS board is a "working" board, according to its members. Meeting agendas and the content of their administrative dashboard seem to indicate a focus on governance rather than on management. Meeting agendas also point to active oversight of school operations. For example, the data dashboard suggests careful oversight of academics, enrollment, and retention rates. Committee work supports strong school oversight. The board is effective at requesting the most important data in the clearest form. For example, the board has asked that data be disaggregated showing the relationship between years at the school and achievement. Committees take a detailed look at the information and report to the full board. The school leader works most closely with the academic committee. The board has created systems for careful monitoring of school finances. The AHS board has regular contact with the CSO liaison.
- Indicator d: Board members indicate the school's attorney is responsible for regular policy reviews.
- Indicator e: The school leaders reported the board has a leadership evaluation process based on performance goals for school leadership. The board members reported that they have a self-reflection protocol for themselves.
- Indicator f: A CSO review of regular board meetings, committee, and board retreat agendas suggests that the AHS board is aware of its charge and legal obligations as trustees. The school's lawyer helps them in this area by answering or pointing out the school's legal responsibilities. The board focus group reported feeling confident in this area.

Benchmark 7: Organizational Capacity

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

Finding: Meets

	<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
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.

Over the term of this charter, the trajectory for this benchmark has remained as a Meets.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 7:

1. Element: *School Leadership:*

Indicator a: The leadership focus group expressed confidence in their efficacy in promoting the mission and vision of AHS. The school has added leadership positions to further ensure the attainment of its mission and goals for improvement. The CEO has two assistant principals (5-6 and 7-8) and a student support manager to join her in the task of leading a school that continuously improves. The assistant principals directly supervise the staff of their grade

teams. They are involved in logistics, fostering a positive culture, and instructional practices. The student support manager supervises instructional coaches, special education teachers, academic support teachers, ELL teacher, and counselor. A team comprised of four deans of students helps the assistant principal in the development of a positive school culture that facilitates instruction. The teacher focus group, coaches focus group, and dean of students focus group expressed confidence that the leadership structure is working well for the school. **Indicator b:** Several documents show that the roles of leaders, staff, operations/management, and board members are clearly defined in writing. All focus groups agreed on having a clear vision of their roles. They define their roles in a manner consistent with the job descriptions.

Indicator c: Teaching teams meet daily and whole faculty meetings are scheduled for most weeks. However, communication systems at AHS rely most on modern technology. These include mobile apps to facilitate communication such as Google Mail, Google Drive, Google Chat groups, Zoom mobile app, and Group Me app. The school routinely publishes a newsletter called "Under the Microscope" that contains items of importance to communication with faculty and staff. Members of the teacher focus group clearly stated that communication at the school is "great."

Indicator d: AHS is currently fully staffed. The school has comprehensive policies for progressive discipline and removal of staff. The school had some problems with recruitment and retention during its first three years. Leaders state that, besides the area's lack of teaching candidates, the lack of knowledge and/or incompatibility with the school's model of instruction, inadaptability to the demands proper to the first years of a new organization, and poor performance explain the challenges in this area. During the 2022-2023 school year, leadership saw the need to make significant changes to XXXX during the school year. Despite the difficulty with recruitment after the beginning of school, the school was able to end the year fully staffed. Some cases of teachers not being retained were due to performance issues, which point to the organization's capacity and willingness to terminate staff deemed ineffective. Other reasons include health/injury, full-time graduate school, and disagreement with the school's instructional model. School leaders also pointed out that most of the non-retentions represent first-year teachers.

2. Element: Professional Climate:

Indicator a: The school is fully staffed, including new positions, and has wide support for its staffing model and effectiveness within the school community. Members of the teacher focus group agreed that the school runs more smoothly than in its early years due to staffing and leadership improvements. Board members and leaders confirmed that the number and quality of operational staff provide widespread satisfaction with how the school operates.

Indicator b: AHS arranges and supports teacher collaboration by assigning two preparation/collaboration periods a day, using communication technology among team members, and facilitating team meetings. Teaching teams meet daily, and coaches meet with them weekly.

Indicator c: AHS has a comprehensive, well-documented hiring protocol that includes a rigorous application and interview process that ensures qualifications. It also provides support to employees to secure certification when needed. The support teachers receive from coaches, assistant principals, deans of students, etc., not only improves their efficacy but also works as an incentive for retention. AHS offers a competitive compensation and benefits program, and the way the school is run is also a retention incentive. Due to its rigorous hiring

process, support systems, and compensation approach, the school attracts teachers and staff who meet students' needs.

Indicator d: The school focuses on developing teachers through collaboration and professional development. The school is willing to work with any teacher to fill any XXXXX gap in their expertise. AHS has demonstrated its willingness and capacity to terminate employment for performance issues. AHS has a formal teacher evaluation system that follows accepted practice. The AHS Teacher Performance Management System is a transparent and balanced evaluation tool.

Indicator e: The school uses the TNTP National Insight Survey. Survey results have elicited changes in school culture, identifying areas for improvement, and the professional development schedule. AHS has an electronic method to leave anonymous feedback for administrative attention.

3. Element: Contractual Relationships:

- Indicator a: n/a
- Indicator b: n/a
- Indicator c: n/a

Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements

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

Finding: Approaches

Element

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.

Indicators

b. The school has fully implemented the key design elements in the approved charter and in any subsequently approved revisions.

Over the term of this charter, the trajectory for this benchmark has remained as Approaches due to a lack of progress in fully implementing all key design elements.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 8:

1. Element: *Mission and Key Design Elements*

- Indicator a: There is a discrepancy between the mission as stated in the original charter application, when compared with the mission in the renewal application. CSO records do not show that the school submitted a revision request to change its mission. If the school wants to do so, it should reference the CSO Revision Guidance for next steps. Until receiving CSO approval, the school should continue to use the NYSED-approved mission in its original charter application. Though only a very few stakeholders could recite the mission verbatim, participants in the focus groups conducted during the visit could explain in their own words what the school stands for in ways consistent with the mission. AHS has six well-defined key design elements. When members of the school community were speaking to a key design element, they used their own descriptive words.
- Indicator b: AHS Key Design Elements include:
 - A culture of collective efficacy, growth, and leadership for students, families, and staff. The hiring procedures and hiring documents, as well as the induction professional development agendas, are evidence of how the school values and implements this key design element.
 - Positive School Culture: Establishment of a healthy community and safe, supportive learning environments for all students. The school states that this key design element starts with building authentic relationships among all school community members. A glimpse of this element was observed in the way students and teachers talked to each other during the visit and in the way the members of the teacher focus group spoke about colleagues.
 - College and Career Readiness: A NYSLS/CCLS-based college and career-ready curriculum based on the Health Sciences and STEAM priorities: AHS declares that this design element is supported by the rigor of its academic program and high expectations. Data and observations support that rigor is evident. The school also states that the topic of future education is regularly approached at AHS. This assertion could not be observed during the visit. Also not observed was an environment in which health sciences are front and center at the school. The health and science focus does not "hit you in the face" at

AHS. The community health focus of health courses was not observed nor was evidence of theme integration with other subjects.

- Middle School Preparation Starting in Grade 5: A New Beginning for Academic Excellence. This key design element relates to the school's belief that Grade 5 is the best developmental point to begin impacting achievement at middle school.
- Data and Student-Driven Instruction: Evidence-based tiered Response to Intervention (Rtl) supports for all students. The school's belief in this key design element's importance is well documented. The renewal application states that "Data and student-driven instruction starts every day with clear success criteria for learning in every single room and lesson." During the visit, however, few objectives for the lessons or "I can" statements were posted. The walls were exhibiting multiple signs about the learning environment (discipline) and very few if any graphic organizers or students' work. There is no overt evidence of student-driven instruction. It is difficult to have a sense of response to intervention without evidence of data and student-driven instruction.
- Effective Teaching Strategies: Thoughtful planning and delivery of engaging, culturally relevant, and effective pedagogy. The professional development agendas, the coach's work, and the tools provided to teachers make the emphasis on this design element evident. The quality of instruction in the observed classes varied.
- Extended and Enhanced Learning: A longer school day and year provides access to enhanced educational experiences, including a summer bridge program. AHS offers extended days Monday through Thursday, weekday and weekend tutoring groups, and summer programs that have been conducted online. They also offer an undefined number of career experience visits in the community.

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

	<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
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.

Over the term of this charter, the trajectory for this benchmark has remained Falls Far Below due to consistent under-enrollment of subgroups, declining overall enrollment, and low retention rates for SWD and ELL students.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 9:

- 1. Element: *Targets are met:*
 - Indicator a: For 2022-2023, the school exceeded the DOL enrollment of economically disadvantaged (ED) students by +4 percentage points.
- 2. Element: *Targets are not met:*
 - Indicator a: For 2022-2023, the school was under-enrolled at 73 percent of their contracted enrollment. AHS enrolled SWD and ELL students at lower rates than the DOL, -10 percentage points and -16, respectively. Retention rates for all, SWD, ELL, and ED students were also below the DOL, -28, -35, -10, and -27 percentage points, respectively.
 - Indicator b: The school has taken the following steps to address these deficiencies including:
 - \circ $\;$ hiring a student recruitment and marketing manager, and an ELL teacher,
 - o operating from a new, efficient, and attractive building, and

 analyzing the efficacy of the different ways it advertises to explicitly target these two populations more effectively.

The school claims that the slight increase in these two groups points to a pattern of significant increase in the future.

• Indicator c: School leadership and the recruitment and marketing manager have analyzed the efficacy of ways and mediums through which the school is marketed. This analysis allows them to target ELL and SWD recruitment in the most effective ways. The school is currently emphasizing that SWD and ELL students are accepted at the Academy. AHS has created programs specifically aimed at supporting these two groups. The school currently has the personnel necessary to support SWD and ELL students at a significantly higher number.

See Attachment 1 for data tables and additional information.

Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance

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

Finding: Meets

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.
------------------------	---

Over the term of this charter, the trajectory for this benchmark has remained as a Meets.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 10:

Element: Legal Compliance:

- Indicator a: The school has a good record of complying with its charter provisions, required reports, laws and policies related to the recruitment, enrollment, and admission of students, financial oversight, open meeting laws, and laws and regulations covering employee and student rights. Analysis of the faculty/staff roster submitted with the 2022-2023 Annual Report showed that the school is within statutory limits for uncertified teachers. However, fingerprint clearance for one staff member could not be verified and the school has not provided the requested documentation. The school also had five staff hired during the 2022-2023 school year that began working prior to full clearance.
- Indicator b: The school has not been asked to take any significant corrective action in matters • of compliance, and it has not received any Notice of Deficiency. The board has appointed its legal counsel as a monitor and advisor on compliance issues.
- Indicator c: AHS maintains regular communication with the Charter School Office on issues related to changes in their operations and has only requested one material revision request, which was to relocate the school to its current facility. The school has altered its mission statement; without CSO approval, the altered statement may not be used.

2024 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Overview

Charter School	Selection		BEDS Code	2022-2023 Enrollment
ACADEMY OF HEALTH SCIENC	CES CHARTER SCHOOL		261600861153	312
ESEA Accountability Designation	This school is designated as a school in need of	Targeted	d Support and Improvement	

 ountability Designation
 This school is designated as a school in need of
 Targeted Support and Improvement

 (2023-2024):
 under current New York State criteria as defined by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Charter School Information

BoR Charter School Office Information

Susan Gibbons

School District of Location:	ROCHESTER CSD	Regional Liaison:
Total Public School Enrollment of Resident Students attending Charter Schools:	25%	Performance Fram
Additional School District: (if applicable)*	-	Current Term:
Total Public School Enrollment of Resident Students attending Charter Schools:	-	2019-2020
Grades Served:	5-8	2020-2021
Address:	1151 RIDGEWAY AVE, ROCHESTER, NY, 14615	2021-2022
Website:	www.ahscharter.org	2022-2023
RIC:	MONROE/M.A.A.R.S.	2023-2024
Regents Region:	CENTRAL	
Regent:	Adrian I. Hale	Bench Rat
Active Date:	7/1/2019	BM1
Authorizer:	REGENTS	BM2
CEO:	MS. WANDA PEREZ-BRUNDAGE	вмз
CEO Phone:	585-207-0590	BM4
CEO Email:	wandaperez@ahscharter.org	BM5
BOT President:	MR. WARREN HERN	BM6
BOT President Phone:	585-254-1003	BM7
BOT President Email:	whern1044@gmail.com	BM8
Institution ID:	80000090716	ВМ9
** 1000 100000 10000		

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

Performance Framework:	2015
Current Term:	07/01/19 - 06/30/24
2019-2020	Check-in
2020-2021	Check-in
2021-2022	Midterm
2022-2023	Check-in
2023-2024	Renewal
Benchmark Rating	Year of Rating
BM1	
BM2	

	Rating	Year of Rating
BM1		
BM2		
BM3		
BM4		
BM5		
BM6		
BM7		
BM8		
BM9		
BM10		

CSO Survey Results	Confidence Interval	Response Rate	Survey Population	Total Responses
Parent Survey	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student Survey (Grades 9-12)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Teacher Survey	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

2024 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 1 - Indicator 1: Similar Schools Comparison

	Acaden	ny of Health Sciences CS		ELA Differential	Math Differential	Science Differential	Graduatio Rate Differentia
Middle School	+/- 7.5	IS 392		-37	-14	-47	
		Mont Pleasant MS		+6	+9	-9	
		Red Jacket MS		-18	-9	-24	
			Mean	-16	-5	-27	
	+/- 10	Brownsville Collegiate CS		-3	+4		
		Gaskill Preparatory School		-2	+1		
		George Washington MS		-9	-4	-26	
		Hawtree Creek MS		-39	-21	-40	•
		MS 180 Dr Daniel Hale Williams		-31	-9		
		North Albany Academy MS		+2	+8	-3	
		Persell MS		-8	-8	-53	
		Randall MS		-16	-19		
		Thomas Jefferson MS		-12	-11	-59	
			Mean	-13	-7	-36	
			Mean	-14	-6	-33	

Charter School

ACADEMY OF HEALTH SCIENCES CHARTER SCHOOL

*See NOTES (1) and (11).

2024 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

Charter School

ACADEMY OF HEALTH SCIENCES CHARTER SCHOOL

2.a.i. and 2.a.ii. Trending Toward Proficiency – Aggregate and Subgroup Standards-Based Trend Toward Proficiency:

Acadomy of Upalth		El	A		Math					
Academy of Health Sciences CS	All Students	SWD	D ELL ED		All Students	SWD	ELL	ED		
2021-2022	39%	19%		36%	12%	0%		11%		
2022-2023	46%	24%	38%	45%	35%	10%	42%	34%		

Elementary/Middle School Trending Toward Proficiency - Minimum Expectation = 80%

*See NOTES (2), (3), (7), and (8).

2024 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

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



Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency State and District Differentials Over Time Comparison of Academy of Health Sciences CS and Rochester CSD

*See NOTES (1), (2), (3), and (6).

2024 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

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

	ELA							Math					Science			
		Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	District Differential	NYS	NYS Differential	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	District Differential	NYS	NYS Differential	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	District Differential	NYS	NYS Differential
All Students	2021-2022	23%	15%	+8	48%	-25	11%	6%	+5	37%	-26					
All Students	2022-2023	28%	17%	+11	49%	-21	17%	10%	+7	49%	-32	38%	6%	+32	48%	-10
SWD	2021-2022	7%	1%	+6	16%	-9	0%	1%	-1	12%	-12					
300	2022-2023	5%	3%	+2	18%	-13	3%	3%	0	20%	-17	14%	3%	+11	25%	-11
ELL	2021-2022	13%	9%	+4	29%	-16	25%	5%	+20	21%	+4					
CLL	2022-2023	29%	11%	+18	27%	+2	31%	7%	+24	30%	+1					
ED	2021-2022	21%	13%	+8	38%	-17	9%	4%	+5	26%	-17					
ED	2022-2023	26%	14%	+12	40%	-14	15%	9%	+6	38%	-23	37%	5%	+32	40%	-3

Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes: Charter School, District, and NYS

*See NOTES (1), (2), (3), (6), and (7).

2024 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

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

				ELA				м	athemati	ics				Science		
All Students		Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS
Crada E	2022	8%	8%	0	38%	-30	13%	6%	+7	37%	-24					1.1
Grade 5	2023	13%	13%	0	45%	-32	5%	11%	-6	50%	-45					1.1
Grade 6	2022	31%	23%	+8	57%	-26	11%	8%	+3	39%	-28					1.1
Grade o	2023	27%	15%	+12	46%	-19	21%	12%	+9	48%	-27					1.1
Crada 7	2022	25%	13%	+12	48%	-23	10%	4%	+6	36%	-26					
Grade 7	2023	23%	18%	+5	48%	-25	12%	11%	+1	52%	-40					
Grade 8	2023	40%	21%	+19	56%	-16	22%	4%	+18	43%	-21	38%	6%	+32	48%	-10

All Students Grade-Level Proficiency

*See NOTES (1), (3), (6), and (7).

2.b.iv. Subgroup Grade-Level Proficiency:

Students with Disabilities Grade-Level Proficiency

				ELA				м	athemati	ics				Science		
Students with Disabilities		Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS
Crada F	2022		1%	-1	11%	-11										
Grade 5	2023	13%	4%	+9	17%	-4	13%	3%	+10	22%	-9					
Grade 6	2022	9%	1%	+8	22%	-13	1.1	1%	-1	11%	-11					
Grade 6	2023		3%	-3	15%	-15		3%	-3	19%	-19					
Crada 7	2022	9%	2%	+7	16%	-7		0%	0	10%	-10					
Grade 7	2023	8%	3%	+5	17%	-9		2%	-2	21%	-21					
Grade 8	2023		3%	-3	23%	-23		2%	-2	19%	-19	14%	3%	+11	25%	-11

*See NOTES (1), (2), (3), (6), and (7).

2024 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

2.b.iv. Subgroup Grade-Level Proficiency:

				ELA				м	athemati	ics	
	anguage ners	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS
Grade 7	2023	25%	13%	+12	23%	+2	14%	7%	+7	30%	-16

English Language Learners Grade-Level Proficiency

*See NOTES (1), (2), (3), (6), and (7).

2.b.iv. Subgroup Grade-Level Proficiency:

Mathematics ELA Science Academy of Health Academy of Health Academy of Health Differential to NYS Differential to NYS Differential to NYS Rochester CSD 2 Rochester CSD 2 Rochester CSD 2 Sciences CS Sciences CS Sciences CS Economically Differential Differential Differential District District District NYS NYS NYS Disadvantaged 8% -19 4% 2022 6% +2 27% 11% +7 26% -15 Grade 5 5% 2023 13% 11% +2 36% -23 10% -5 38% -33 2022 26% 21% +5 47% -21 8% 7% +1 27% -19 Grade 6 2023 24% 13% +11 36% -12 19% 10% +9 37% -18 2022 25% 11% +14 39% -14 9% 2% +7 25% -16 Grade 7 2023 22% 16% +6 39% -17 12% 10% 41% -29 +2 Grade 8 2023 39% 18% +21 48% -9 20% 3% +17 36% -16 37% 5% +32 40% -3

Economically Disadvantaged Grade-Level Proficiency

*See NOTES (1), (3), (6), and (7).

2024 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 9 - Indicator 1: Enrollment and Retention

Charter School

ACADEMY OF HEALTH SCIENCES CHARTER SCHOOL

1.a.i. Aggregrate Enrollment:

Academy of Health Sciences CS	Contracted Enrollment	Reported Enrollment	Percent of Contracted Enrollment
2019-2020	100	104	104%
2020-2021	200	206	103%
2021-2022	300	272	91%
2022-2023	425	312	73%

Aggregate Enrollment: Reported vs Contracted - Target = 100%

1.a.ii. Subgroup Enrollment:

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

		SWD			ELL		ED			
	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	
2019-2020	15%	25%	-10	1%	19%	-18	98%	91%	+7	
2020-2021	11%	23%	-12	3%	19%	-16	83%	92%	-9	
2021-2022	11%	22%	-11	3%	19%	-16	90%	92%	-2	
2022-2023	12%	22%	-10	4%	20%	-16	96%	92%	+4	

*See NOTES (2) and (6).

2024 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 9 - Indicator 1: Enrollment and Retention

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

				netentia	JII - Aggieg	ate and Ju	ngi oups					
	4	All Student	s	SWD				ELL		ED		
	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District	Academy of Health Sciences CS	Rochester CSD	Differential to District
2020-2021	76%	88%	-12	56%	88%	-32	0%	89%	-89	76%	88%	-12
2021-2022	67%	85%	-18	73%	89%	-16	50%	87%	-37	68%	85%	-17
2022-2023	56%	84%	-28	52%	87%	-35	75%	85%	-10	57%	84%	-27

Retention - Aggregate and Subgroups

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

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

Not applicable to this charter school

*See NOTES (2), (3), and (10) below.

2024 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Notes

(1) Data in the table above represents tested students who scored proficiently on the NYSTP ELA, math, or science assessments or on the Regents math or science exams.

(2) For the students with disabilities and the English language learners subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.

(3) Pursuant to NYSED business rules, the data was suppressed for subgroups containing <5 students and the subgroup category may not be included for the metric.

(4) Data in the table above represents students who passed the Annual Regents or equivalents (score of 65 or better).

(5) The 4- and 5-year graduation rates reported are as of August. The 6-year graduation rates are as of June.

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

(7) A "." in any table indicates that the data was suppressed, no student sat for the exam, or the exam was not given.

(8) Data in the table above represents tested students who either maintained a proficient score from one year to the next or students whose proficiency level increased from one year to the next (a proficient score is level 3 or 4).

(9) Data in the table above represents students within their respective subgroups who have passed three out of the five Annual Regents and Regents Common Core Examinations (score of 65 or better) or equivalents.

(10) Data in the table above represents the percentage of students from the original 9th grade cohort who persisted within the same school to a 4-year graduation (includes August graduates).

(11) Data in the table above is a comparison of the differentials of the 3-8 assessments and the 4-year graduation rate for the school and other schools with the same grade structure and similar subgroup enrollment pattern. The notation +/- 5, indicates the highest level of similarity.

(12) Data in the table above represents students who passed their Regents ELA exam with a score equal to or higher than 75 and also passed at least one of their Regents math exams with a score equal to or higher than 80.

(13) Schools are considered 'similar' for the purpose of this comparison when they serve the same grade band as the school in question. The degree of similarity is determined by comparison of the percentage of each subgroup's enrollment (students with disabilities, English language learners, and economically disadvantaged students. An assignment of +/- 5 (7.5, or 10) indicates that the schools' subgroup enrollments are within 5 (7.5, or 10) percentage points for each subgroup.



Charter School Fiscal Accountability Summary

			2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23			Chartered vs. Actual Enrollment
		Grades Served	-	5	5-6	5-7	5-8		400	
		Maximum Chartered Grades Served Chartered Enrollment		5-8	5-8 200	5-8 300	5-8 425	¥	300	
		Maximum Chartered Enrollment	-	450	450	450	450	inrollment	200	
_	_	Actual Enrollment	-	104	206	273	312	Enro	100	
		ASSETS Current Assets								2019 2020 2021 2022 2023
		Cash and Cash Equivalents	-	329,187	957,567	1,701,570	3,164,300			Chartered Enrollment Actual Enrollment
		Grants and Contracts Receivable Prepaid Expenses	-	224,887 48,041	134,965 37,338	1,377,784 34,562	479,926 19,713			Cash, Assets and Liabilities
		Other Current Assets	-	-	-	-	-		2023	
		Total Current Assets Non-Current Assets	-	602,115	1,129,870	3,113,916	3,663,939		2022	
		Property, Building and Equipment, net	-	61,851	171,860	111,884	12,256,634			
		Restricted Cash Security Deposits	-	25,000 14,513	50,000 14,513	75,000 14,513	9,145,428 14,513	Year	2021	P
	NO	Other Non-Current Assets	-	-	-		45,594		2020	P
		Total Non - Current Assets Total Assets	-	101,364 703,479	236,373 1,366,243	201,397 3,315,313	21,462,169 25,126,108		2019	
	IAL P	LIABILITIES and NET ASSETS	-							0 5,000 10,000 15,000 20,000 25,000 30,000
	FINANCIAL	Current Liabilities		14,070	76,502	49,383	60,138			Thousands
	OF FI	Accounts Payable and Accrued Expenses Accrued Payroll and Payroll Taxes		87,678	166,625	217,477	245,570		Ci	ash and Cash Equivalents Total Assets Total Liabilities
	TENT	Due to Related Parties Refundable Advances		-	-	-				Net Assets
	ATEN	Other Current Liabilities		113,648	-	-	83,427		2023	
		Total Current Liabilities Long-Term Liabilities	-	215,396	243,127	266,860	389,135			-
		Deferred Rent	-	-	-	-			2022	
S		Other Long-Term Liabilities Total Long-Term Liabilities		101,284 101,284	-		21,072,583 21,072,583	Year	2021	
ΡΓ		Total Liabilities	-	316,680	243,127	266,860	21,461,718		2020	
Ū		NET ASSETS							2019	
FINANCIAL		Unrestricted Restricted	-	386,799	1,123,116	3,048,453	1,947,248 1,717,142			0 1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000
Ź		Total Net Assets	-	386,799	1,123,116	3,048,453	3,664,390			Thousands
		Total Liabilities and Net Assets	-	703,479	1,366,243	3,315,313	25,126,108	1		Restricted Unrestricted
ED	Ē	OPERATING REVENUE								Revenue & Expenses
DIT		State and Local Per Pupil Revenue - Reg. Ed	-	1,413,723	2,888,895	3,890,934	4,337,954		7,000	
AUI		State and Local Per Pupil Revenue - SPED State and Local Per Pupil Facilities Revenue	-		-	-			6,000	
⋖		Federal Grants	-	-	-	-		spi	5,000	
		State and City Grants Other Operating Income	-	656,007 141,729	387,409 233,445	1,940,480 24,504	828,042 55,702	Thousands	4,000	
		Total Operating Revenue	-	2,211,459	3,509,749	5,855,918	5,221,698	f	3,000	
		EXPENSES							2,000	
		Program Services Regular Education	- 1	932,190	1,387,652	2,308,573	2,695,396	1	1,000	
	IVITIE	Special Education	-	139,626	296,798	478,132	573,766		-	2019 2020 2021 2022 2023
	OF ACTIVITIES	Other Expenses Total Program Services	-	79,471 1,151,287	88,657 1,773,107	95,865 2,882,570	101,781 3,370,943			Operating Non-Operating Expenses
		Supporting Services Management and General		673,373	1,000,325	1,048,011	1,242,746			Change in Net Assets
	ME	Fundraising		6/3,3/3	1,000,325	1,048,011	1,242,740			-
		i ullulaising	-	-	-	-	-			
		Total Support Services	-	673,373	1,000,325	1,048,011	1,242,746		2023	
			-	- 673,373 1,824,660 386,799	1,000,325 2,773,432 736,317	1,048,011 3,930,581 1,925,337	- 1,242,746 4,613,689 608,009		2023	
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE	-	1,824,660	2,773,432	3,930,581	4,613,689 608,009		-	
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income		1,824,660	2,773,432	3,930,581	4,613,689	Year	2022	
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support		1,824,660	2,773,432	3,930,581	4,613,689 608,009	Year	2022	
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue		1,824,660	2,773,432	3,930,581	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 - - -	Year	2022 2021 2020	
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets		1,824,660	2,773,432 736,317 - - - - - - - - - - - - 736,317	3,930,581 1,925,337 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 - - - - 7,928 615,937	Year	2022 2021 2020 2019	
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue		1,824,660 386,799 - - - - - -	2,773,432 736,317 - - - - - - -	3,930,581 1,925,337 - - - - - - -	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Year	2022 2021 2020 2019	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - End of Year		1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	3,930,581 1,925,337 - - - - 1,925,337 1,123,116	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 - - - 7,928 615,937 3,048,453	Year	2022 2021 2020 2019	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year		1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	3,930,581 1,925,337 - - - - 1,925,337 1,123,116	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 - - - 7,928 615,937 3,048,453	Year	2022 2021 2020 2019	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - End of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil Operating		1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	3,930,581 1,925,337 - - - - 1,925,337 1,123,116	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 16,736	Year	2022 2021 2020 2019	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Defits from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - Seginning of Year Net Assets - ENG Of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil		1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 - - - 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390	Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 Net Ass	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands ets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Other Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - End of Year Net Assets - End of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil		1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 	ids) Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 Net Ass 7,000 6,000	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands ets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Defits from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Upil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue		1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 1,925,337 1,123,116 3,048,453 21,450 3,370 21,450 21	4,613,689 608,009 	ids) Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 Net Ass	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands ets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Bedjinning of Year Net Assets - Bedjinning of Year Net Assets - End of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses		1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	4,613,689 608,009 	ids) Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 2019 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands ets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Other Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - End of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Management and Other	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1,824,660 386,799 386,799 386,799 386,799 21,264 21,264 11,070 6,475 17,545 63,1% 36,9%	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 16,736 25 16,762 16,736 25 16,762 10,804 3,983 14,787 7,31,% 25,5%	ids) Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands ets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - End of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses		1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 1,925,337 1,123,116 3,048,453 21,450 	4,613,689 608,009 	Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 2019 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands ets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
S		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - Bed of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services % of Program Services	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 - - - 1,925,337 1,123,116 3,048,453 21,450 21,450 21,450 10,559 3,839 14,538 73,3% 26,7% 49,0%	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	enue & Expenses (in thousands)	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 0 Net Ass 7,000 6,000 5,000 4,000 3,000	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands ets - Beginning of Year • Change in Net Assets • End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
YSIS		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - End of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING:	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 	Expenses (in thousands)	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1,00 2,00 3,00 4,00 Thousands ets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets - End of Year
SISY		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 - - - 1,925,337 1,123,116 3,048,453 21,450 21,450 21,450 10,559 3,839 14,538 73,3% 26,7% 49,0%	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	enue & Expenses (in thousands)	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000 Thousands ets - Beginning of Year • Change in Net Assets • End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
SISY		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - Beginning of Year Support and Other Revenue Beginses - Per Pupil Program Services % of Management and General, Fundraising Total Expenses BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 15: - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 	enue & Expenses (in thousands)	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
SISY		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - Seginning of Year Net Assets - Seginning of Year Net Assets - Beginning of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services % of Program Services % of Program Services % of Management and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Net Monitor Capital Net Working Capital	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 	Year Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 2019 0 0 0 Net Ass 7,000 5,000 4,000 3,000 1,000	1,00 2,00 3,00 4,00 Tousands et - Beginning of Year • Change in Net Assets • End of Year Encolment vs. Revenue & Expense Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output Output
SISY		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Morking Capital Working Capital (Current) Ratio	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 386,799 386,799 221,264 21,264 21,264 21,264 386,799 2.2.55 5.0.3% 21.2% 2.65 Strong 386,719 2.8	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 16,736 25 16,762 10,804 3,983 14,787 73,1% 26,9% 13,4% 25,9% 13,4% 2,5% Strong 3,274,804 9,4	Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 2019 0 0 0 Net Ass 7,000 6,000 2,000 1,000 1,000 -	1,00 2,00 3,00 4,00 Tousands et - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Det Assets - End of Year Change in Net Assets Det Assets - End of Year Change in Net Assets Det Assets - End of Year Change in Net Assets Det Change in Net Assets - End of Year Change in Net Assets Det Change in Net Assets
SISY		Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - Seginning of Year Net Assets - Seginning of Year Net Assets - Beginning of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services % of Program Services % of Program Services % of Management and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Net Monitor Capital Net Working Capital	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 	core Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1,00 2,00 3,00 4,00 Tousands ets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets - End of Year Change in Net Asset - End of Year Change
S	RATIOS, BENCHMARKS and FINDINGS	Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - Bed of Year Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services % of Program Services	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 16,786 25 16,762 10,884 3,983 14,787 73,154 20,9% 13,45% 3,983 14,787 73,15% 20,9% 13,45% 21,5 Strong 3,274,804 9,4 Meets Standard	core Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 2019 0 0 0 Net Ass 7,000 6,000 2,000 1,000 1,000 -	1,00 2,00 3,00 4,00 Tousands et - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Det Assets - End of Year Change in Net Assets Det Assets - End of Year Change in Net Assets Det Assets - End of Year Change in Net Assets Det Change in Net Assets - End of Year Change in Net Assets Det Change in Net Assets
SISY	RATIOS, BENCHMARKS and FINDINGS	Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Assets - Seginning of Year Net Assets - Ho of Year REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services % of Program Services % of Program Services % of Management and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Management and Other & Servenue EENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Net downing Capital (Current) Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2 DEBT O ASSET Debt to Asset Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING:	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 386,799 386,799 221,264 21,264 21,264 21,264 386,799 2.2.55 5.0.3% 21.2% 2.65 Strong 386,719 2.8	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 16,736 25 16,762 10,804 3,983 14,787 73,1% 26,9% 13,4% 25,9% 13,4% 2,5% Strong 3,274,804 9,4	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 0 Net Ass 7,000 5,000 1,000 1,000 1,000 2,000 1,000 2,000 1,000 2,000 1,000 2,0000 2,000 2,0000 2,000 2,000 2,000 2,	1,00 2,00 3,00 4,00 Tousands et - Beginning of Year entropy en
SISY	RATIOS, BENCHMARKS and FINDINGS	Total Support Services Total Support Services Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services % of Program Services % of Progra	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 - 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 - 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 51 10,804 3,983 14,787 73,148 26,9% 13,4% 26,9% 13,4% 24,804 9,4 4,483 3,274,804 9,4 Meets Standard	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 2019 0 Net Ass 7,000 6,000 5,000 1,000 1,000 1,000 5,00	
SISY	RATIOS, BENCHMARKS and FINDINGS	Total Support Services Total Support Services Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Strong: 15 - 30 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9 WORKING CAPITAL Net Working Capital Working Capital (Current) Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2 Debt to Asset Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0 CASH POSITION	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 16,736 16,736 16,736 16,736 16,736 16,736 16,736 10,804 3,983 14,787 773,1% 26,9% 11,4% 26,9% 27,9% 28,9% 24,9%24,9% 24,9% 24,9%24,9% 24,9% 24,9%24,9% 24,9% 24,9%24,9% 24,9% 24,9% 24,9%24,9% 24,9% 24,9%24,9% 24,9% 24,9%24,9% 24,9% 24,9%24,9%24,9%24,9	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands) Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 0 Net Ass 7,000 5,000 1,000 1,000 1,000 2,000 1,000 2,000 1,000 2,000 1,000 2,0000 2,000 2,0000 2,000 2,000 2,000 2,	1,00 2,00 3,00 4,00 Tousands et - Beginning of Year entropy en
SISY	RATIOS, BENCHMARKS and FINDINGS	Total Support Services Total Expenses Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Morean And Other Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services % of Management and General, Fundraising Total Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2 DEBT CO ASSET Debt to Asset Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0 CASH POSITION Days of Cash BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 - 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 - 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 16,736 25 51 10,804 3,983 14,787 73,148 26,9% 13,4% 26,9% 13,4% 24,804 9,4 4,483 3,274,804 9,4 Meets Standard	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands) Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 2019 0 0 Net Ass 7,000 6,000 5,000 4,000 3,000 2,000 1,000 - 1,000 - 2,000 - 2,0	1,00 2,00 3,00 4,00 Tousands 0 tange in Net Assets 0 talsets - End of Vear Furdiment vs. Revenue & Expense Tousands
SISY	RATIOS, BENCHMARKS and FINDINGS	Total Support Services Total Support Services Surplus/Deficit from Operations Surplox/Deficit from Operations Surplox/Deficit from Operations Surplox/Deficit from Operations Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Working Charlat Net Working Capital Working Capital (Current) Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2 CASH POSITION Days of Cash BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 60 days	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 16,736 25 16,762 16,762 10,804 3,983 14,787 73,1% 26,9% 13,4% 2,15 Strong 3,274,804 9,4 Meets Standard 0,9 Meets Standard	Days Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands) Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 2019 0 0 Net Ass 7,000 6,000 5,000 4,000 3,000 2,000 1,000 - 10,00 5,00 - 10,00 - 2,000	1,00 2,00 3,00 4,00 Tousands 0 tange in Net Assets 0 talsets - End of Vear Furdiment vs. Revenue & Expense Tousands
SISY	RATIOS, BENCHMARKS and FINDINGS	Total Support Services Total Support Services Surplus/Deficit from Operations SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE Interest and Other Income Contributions and Grants Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Asset Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.0 CASH POSITION Days of Cash BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 60 days TOTAL MARGIN	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 16,736 255 16,762 10,764 10,804 3,983 14,787 73,1% 26,9% 13,4% 22,15 Strong 3,274,804 9,4 Meets Standard 0,9 Meets Standard	Days Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands) Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 2019 0 0 Net Ass 7,000 6,000 5,000 4,000 3,000 2,000 1,000 - 1,000 - 2,000 - 2,0	Log 2,00 3,00 4,00 Tousand T
SISY	RATIOS, BENCHMARKS and FINDINGS	Total Support Services Total Support Services Surplus/Deficit from Operations Surplox/Deficit from Operations Surplox/Deficit from Operations Surplox/Deficit from Operations Fundraising Support Other Support and Revenue Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets Net Assets - Beginning of Year Net Working Charlat Net Working Capital Working Capital (Current) Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2 CASH POSITION Days of Cash BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 60 days	0.0%	1,824,660 386,799 	2,773,432 736,317 736,317 	3,930,581 1,925,337 	4,613,689 608,009 7,928 615,937 3,048,453 3,664,390 16,736 25 16,762 16,762 10,804 3,983 14,787 73,1% 26,9% 13,4% 2,15 Strong 3,274,804 9,4 Meets Standard 0,9 Meets Standard	Days Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands) Year	2022 2021 2020 2019 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Log 2,00 3,00 4,00 Tousand T