



New York State Education Department

Renewal Site Visit Report 2016-2017

Urban Dove Team Charter School

Visit Date: 11/02/2016 - 11/03/2016

Date of Report: 05/19/2017

CONTENTS

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION	2
METHODOLOGY	3
BENCHMARK ANALYSIS	5
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	7
BENCHMARK 1: STUDENT PERFORMANCE.....	9
BENCHMARK 2: TEACHING AND LEARNING.....	12
BENCHMARK 3: CULTURE, CLIMATE AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT	14
BENCHMARK 4: FINANCIAL CONDITION	16
BENCHMARK 5: FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	18
BENCHMARK 6: BOARD OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNANCE	19
BENCHMARK 7: ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY.....	21
BENCHMARK 8: MISSION AND KEY DESIGN ELEMENTS.....	23
BENCHMARK 9: ENROLLMENT, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION	24
BENCHMARK 10: LEGAL COMPLIANCE	26
APPENDIX A: NYS ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES.....	27

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

Charter School Summary¹

Name of Charter School	Urban Dove Team Charter School
Board Chair	Michael Grandis
School Leader	Amit Bahl
District of location	NYC CSD 13
Opening Date	08/27/2012
Charter Terms	Initial Charter Term: 07/1/2012 - 06/30/2017
Educational Partners	Urban Dove, Inc.
Facilities	600 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11216 (private facility)
Mission Statement	<i>Urban Dove Team Charter School (UD Team) is a completely unique and innovative alternative High School for over-aged, under-credited youth whose mission is to combine a rigorous academic curriculum with a hands-on, real-world vocational program, and an award-winning college readiness program that strives to give each graduate a high school diploma, a foundation for higher education, and the job skills needed to enter the world of work. Graduates of UD Team will be healthy, active, focused young adults ready to fulfill their potential. They will have a commitment to their futures, a positive connection to their community and a desire to take advantage of the opportunities before them. UD Team partners with Urban Dove, a non-profit that has specialized in working with at-risk youth for fifteen years. Urban Dove will provide critical support in delivering key elements of the school program, including in the areas of Sports-based Youth Development, College guidance, internships and job-skills and summer programming.</i>
Key Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sports-based youth development (SBYD) • Support Services • More time on task – extended day/year • Same-sex groupings • Multiple Intelligences • Differentiated instruction • Targeted interventions
Revision History	Seeking approval to contract with Urban Dove, Inc., to provide comprehensive charter school management services

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

School Characteristics

Enrollment

School Year	Grades Served	Maximum Approved Enrollment	Actual Enrollment
2016-2017	Ungraded (high school)	265	281 ²
2015-2016	Ungraded (high school)	265	271
2014-2015	Ungraded (high school)	240	207
2013-2014	Ungraded (high school)	170	166
2012-2013	Ungraded (high school)	95	107

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Maximum Authorized Enrollment

School Year	Grades Served	Maximum Authorized Enrollment
2017-2018	Ungraded (high school)	265
2018-2019	Ungraded (high school)	265
2019-2020	Ungraded (high school)	265
2020-2021	Ungraded (high school)	265
2021-2022	Ungraded (high school)	265

METHODOLOGY

A two-day renewal site visit was conducted at Urban Dove Team Charter School (UDTCS) on November 2-3, 2016. The Charter School Office (CSO) team conducted interviews with the board of trustees, school leadership team, instructional leadership team, staff with responsibilities for special populations, and parents. In cooperation with school leadership, the team also administered an anonymous online survey to teachers.

The team conducted 10 classroom observations in Years 1, 2, and 3. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length and were conducted jointly with the school leader or the director of curriculum and instruction.

The documents and data reviewed by the team before, during, and after the site visit included, but were not limited to, the following:

- **Renewal Application**

² Self-reported by Urban Dove Team Charter School in Renewal Site Visit Workbook

- **Renewal Site Visit Workbook**
- **Teacher roster**
- **Current organizational chart**
- **A master school schedule**
- **Board materials**
- **Blank teacher and administrator evaluation forms**
- **Student/family handbook**
- **Enrollment data including subgroups**
- **Professional development plans and schedules**
- **Academic data**
- **NYSED-administered teacher survey**
- **Accountability Measurement Plan (provided by school)**

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

The NYSED Charter School Performance Framework outlines 10 Performance Benchmarks in three key areas of charter school performance:

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

Observational findings from the site visit will be presented in alignment with the [Performance Framework](#) Benchmarks and Indicators according to the rating scale below, although not all indicators will necessarily be assessed on every site visit. A summary of the school’s strengths will precede the benchmark analysis. Each benchmark will be rated; however, the report narrative will highlight those indicators not fully met by the school.

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

For the site visit conducted from November 2-3, 2016 at UDTCS, see the following Performance Benchmark Scores and discussion.

**New York State Education Department
Charter School Performance Framework Rating**

Performance Benchmark		Level
Educational Success	Benchmark 1: Student Performance: The school has met or exceeded achievement indicators for academic trends toward proficiency, proficiency and high school graduation. At all grade levels and all assessments, scoring proficiently means achieving a performance level of 3 or higher (high school Regents and Common Core Regents exam score of 65 or higher).	Approaches
	Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning: School leaders have systems in place designed to cultivate shared accountability and high expectations and that lead to students’ well-being, improved academic outcomes, and educational success. The school has rigorous and coherent curriculum and assessments that are aligned to the New York State Learning Standards (NYSLS) for all students. Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn so that all students experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking and achievement.	Meets
	Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate, and Family Engagement: The school has systems in place to support students’ social and emotional health and to provide for a safe and respectful learning environment. Families, community members and school staff work together to share in the responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being. Families and students are satisfied with the school’s academics and the overall leadership and management of the school.	Meets
Organizational Soundness	Benchmark 4: Financial Condition: The school is in sound and stable financial condition as evidenced by performance on key financial indicators.	Meets
	Benchmark 5: Financial Management: The school operates in a fiscally sound manner with realistic budgets pursuant to a long-range financial plan, appropriate internal controls and procedures, and in accordance with state law and generally accepted accounting practices.	Approaches
	Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance: The board of trustees provides competent stewardship and oversight of the school while maintaining policies, establishing performance goals, and implementing systems to ensure academic success, organizational viability, board effectiveness and faithfulness to the terms of its charter.	Meets
	Benchmark 7: Organizational Capacity: The school has established a well-functioning organizational structure, clearly delineated roles for staff, management, and board members. The school has systems and protocols that allow for the successful implementation, evaluation, and improvement of its academic program and operations.	Meets
Faithfulness to Charter & Law	Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements: The school is faithful to its mission and has implemented the key design elements included in its charter.	Meets
	Benchmark 9: Enrollment, Recruitment, and Retention: The school is meeting or making annual progress toward meeting the enrollment plan outlined in its charter and its enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced priced lunch program; or has demonstrated that it has made extensive good faith efforts to attract, recruit, and retain such students.	Exceeds
	Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance: The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.	Approaches

Summary of Findings

UDTCS is designed to engage and support the academic and social-emotional needs of over-aged, under-credited (OA/UC) students through a sports-based program that promotes team-building, problem-solving, and self-confidence across all aspects of the school.

As per the charter, UDTCS admits students who are 16 years old or younger with eight or fewer high school credits earned at the time of enrollment. Students must have attempted ninth grade at least once. Unlike other schools that serve OA/UC students which accept students on a rolling basis throughout the year, UDTCS only enrolls and groups students at the start of each academic year. Students advance through a three-year high school academic program (which may extend to four or five years if necessary), with a sports-based youth development program and a college and career readiness focus.

In the Renewal Application supplement submitted in fall 2017, UDTCS noted that on average, incoming students in 2012 and 2013 (Class of 2015 and Class of 2016) had completed 1.4 years of high school but only earned six high school credits (of the 44 necessary to graduate) and the majority (82%) had not passed any Regents exams upon entry. According to NYSED data, 35% of the school's population in 2015-2016 were students with disabilities.

Due to the challenges faced by the student population at UDTCS, the school's 2016 NYSED-reported graduation rate data shows low graduation rates, a high ratio of local / Regents diplomas and student drop-out rates of 25-30%. At this point in the school's development, five- and six-year graduation rate information is limited. UDTCS has developed an alternate accountability measurement plan in which it analyzes the persistence and performance of its students in relation to average daily attendance. The school also makes efforts to compare its graduation rates with similar students attending NYC DOE schools, including special student populations, and presents information about progress toward graduation (credits earned) for students who ultimately dropped out. NYSED was unable to verify some of the measures used by the school with publicly available data. Although the NYC DOE OA/UC school peer comparison groups are not perfectly correlated for students under 16 years old, preliminary data suggests that the school's approach may produce better outcomes than NYCDOE OA/UC schools serving students of similar age and credit. The lack of data points with longitudinal data, however, further limits the CSO's ability to analyze this data.

The school was founded in 2010 in partnership with Urban Dove, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation with a youth development mission. Urban Dove provides academic programs such as the College All-Stars and the HiRisers programs, as well as sports-based youth development resources and life and job skills training to the school. Urban Dove also provides back office support in several administrative areas, and is seeking to expand the scope of its charter management services in the upcoming renewal term.

The school is fully-staffed with educators, practitioners, and clinicians who appear to understand their relative roles and responsibilities. All classes are co-taught by two teachers to permit differentiated instruction that meets student needs and engages multiple styles of learning. Site visit interviews and observation demonstrated that communication between and among staff is a cornerstone of the work of the school. Team meetings are held weekly to discuss individual students and share best practices. Teachers are supported by directors, department heads, and coaches who provide feedback and professional development opportunities on an ongoing basis.

The school has a robust social-emotional support team to assist students with the challenges they face as they pursue the completion of their academic program. According to school leaders, parents are viewed as partners and the school offers many opportunities to engage families. Reciprocal communication is valued and the school provides many opportunities to keep parents informed, through the Jupiter portal and other strategies, of positive and negative academic and behavioral issues as they arise.

The board of trustees includes members from the board of Urban Dove, Inc. but does not exceed the limits set forth in the charter agreement. The board meets monthly and receives reports from the school leader and from board committees regarding the school's finances, governance, and academics.

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

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

Because of the unique needs of the student population served by UDTCS, and to fully and fairly evaluate the performance of the school, UDTCS was invited to submit an alternative accountability measurement plan as part of the Renewal Application, describing the school's outcomes over the initial charter term. The alternative accountability plan presents data provided by the NYC DOE to compare the school's performance with similar students attending NYC DOE schools that serve OA/UC students. The comparison analysis is used to supplement other NYSED Performance Framework criteria. UDTCS will be expected to meet Board of Regents charter school academic performance indicators for schools serving OA/UC students over the upcoming charter term. This section will summarize the information provided by the school as part of the charter Renewal Application

Attendance, Persistence and Graduation

UDTCS has analyzed student attendance as an indicator of persistence with the program and ultimately with high school completion. Students in each cohort were divided into three sub-groups – Disengaged (below 60% average daily attendance), Engaged (60% average daily attendance and above) and Highly Engaged (80% average daily attendance and above). Baseline analysis of student outcomes for the UDTCS Class of 2015 and Class of 2016 shows higher persistence and graduation rates by students with average daily attendance of 80% or higher. The school has used this work to set goals for the Attendance Task Force and are striving to attain an average attendance rate of 60% for at least 65% of its enrolled students in the upcoming charter term.

Table 1: UDTCS Attendance, Persistence and Graduation

Class of 2015 Starting Group Size: 94	Dropped	Attending	Graduated
Disengaged – 37% of Student Population	84%	8%	8%
Engaged – 63% of Student Population	9%	16%	75%
Highly Engaged - 32% of Student Population	0%	4.5%	95.5%

Class of 2016 Starting Group Size: 104	Dropped	Attending	Graduated
Disengaged – 52% of Student Population	53%	35%	12%
Engaged – 48% of Student Population	14%	3%	83%
Highly Engaged - 22% of Student Population	0%	23.5%	76.5%

Similar Student Graduation Outcomes

UDTCS used NYC DOE OA/UC student categories to compare graduation outcomes of its students in these categories with similar students in NYC. The analysis is based on information provided by the NYCDOE. Most UDTCS students fall into one of three at-risk categories of OA/UC students: 15 years old with less

than 11 credits, 16 years old with less than 11 credits and no Regents exams passed, and 16 years old with less than 11 credits and one or more Regents exams passed. For each of these three categories, the chart below shows the percentage of the Class in that category, their graduation rate at UDTCS and the graduation rate for the that category citywide.

Table 2: 2016 UDTCS Student Outcomes Compared to Similar NYC DOE Student Outcomes (“Peer Target”)

Class of 2015 – Charter School Entry 2012	Number	NYC Peer Target Graduation Rate	UDTCS Graduate Rate to Date (9 still enrolled)	Variance to Date
15-year-old <11 credits	33	30%*	61%	+31
16-year-old, <11 credits, no Regents	22	27%	41%	+14
16-year old, <11 credits, at least 1 Regents	5	28%	40%	+12
Other OA/UC categories	6	30%	33%	+3
Non OA/UC	2	67%	100%	+33
Total	68			

*The NYC Peer Target for 15 year old students with less than 11 credits was not developed by NYCDOE as part of its transfer school accountability analysis, because this category of students is not included in the DOE definition of OA/UC students. UDTCS identified the target graduation rate on the basis of graduation data for this population that was provided to the school by the NYCDOE.

Class of 2016 – Charter School Entry 2013	Number	Peer Target Graduation Rate	UDTCS Graduation Rate to Date (27 still enrolled)	Variance to Date
15-year-old <11 credits	30	30%	47%	+17
16-year-old, <11 credits, no Regents	26	27%	12%	-15
16-year old, <11 credits, at least 1 Regents	8	28%	25%	-3
Other OA/UC categories	6	30%	67%	+37
Non OA/UC	7	67%	85%	+18
Total	77			

*The NYC Peer Target for 15 year old students with less than 11 credits was not developed by NYCDOE as part of its transfer school accountability analysis, because this category of students is not included in the DOE definition of OA/UC students. UDTCS identified the target graduation rate on the basis of graduation data for this population that was provided to the school by the NYCDOE.

According to data reported by the UDTCS, the graduation rate at UDTCS outperformed its New York City peers for the Class of 2015. For the Class of 2016, however, the graduation rate of UDTCS students outperformed its peers for only the 15-year-old segment of the student population. Sixteen-year-old students with or without Regents exams, which make up 44% of the cohort, underperformed their peers by -15% for 16-year-olds with no Regents exam and -3% for 16-year-olds with one or more Regents exams. (Table 2)

According to UDTCS’ self-reported graduation rates for OA/UC students by NYC DOE designation, all students at UDTCS in the Class of 2015 cohort outperformed schools with students in that designation. For the Class of 2016, all students at UDTCS outperformed the similarly designated schools except those classified as “DOE Most At-Risk OA/UC.” That population, which makes up 35.5% of the cohort, performed below the peer target graduation rate by -8%. (Table 3)

College Enrollment

An additional measure the school used in its alternative accountability assessment was that of College Enrollment. In its Renewal Application, UDTCS compared its post-secondary enrollment rate to NYCDOE schools that serve OA/UC students overall rates since no peer-to-peer analysis was possible. The NYCDOE OA/UC school rate was reported by UDTCS to be 18% with no subgroup delineation for how that 18% was distributed. In comparison, UDTCS reported that it had 23 out of 62 graduates or 37% from its two cohorts enroll in a post-secondary school.

NYSED Cohort Outcomes

As six-year graduation data becomes available in the future, this information will also be considered to assess whether the school is meeting NYSED charter school performance criteria. At this point in the school’s history, graduation rate and valid comparison data is incomplete. The table below is included for informational purposes only.

Table 3: UDTCS 2016 Outcomes by NYSED Cohort*

Source: data.nysed.gov

Cohort	# Students in Cohort	Grad Outcome	Still Enrolled	Dropped Out
2010 cohort: six-year outcome	24	5 (21%) graduated: 2 (13%) Regents / 3 Local (8%)	4 (17%)	15 (63%)
2011 cohort: five-year outcome	80	25 (31%) graduated: 15 (19%) Regents / 10 (13%) Local 1 (1%) GED	29 (36%)	25 (31%)
2012 cohort: four-year (inclusive of August 2016) outcome	89	20 (22%) graduated: 8 (9%) Regents /12 (13%) Local 4 (4%) GED	43 (48%)	21 (24%)

* NYSED defines cohort as a group of students who first entered grade 9 in the same school year.

As six-year graduation data becomes available in the future, this information will also be considered to assess whether the school is meeting NYSED charter school performance criteria. At this point in the school’s history, graduation rate and valid comparison data is incomplete.

Diploma Types

According to NYS School Report Card data, 50% of UDTCS graduates in the 2010, 2011 and 2012 cohorts received Regents diplomas while 50% received local diplomas.

Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning

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

Finding: Meets

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

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 2:

UDTCS' curriculum is based on a three-year scope and sequence cohort system. All students who enter the same year together are considered part of the same class, but may ultimately progress through the curriculum at different rates, depending on intervention needs, attendance, and other factors.

Curricula are reported to be aligned with the NYSL. Because students enter the school after one or more unsuccessful years in high school, Year 1 is focused on addressing deficits. The school has implemented Read 180 and Math 180 to help students acquire the background in these critical content areas. Teachers and the director of curriculum and instruction meet in the summer to develop curriculum and the

supporting unit and lesson plans to fulfill curriculum objectives. They use the Understanding by Design framework to ensure that units and lessons have essential questions and that higher order thinking opportunities are woven throughout the lessons. Teachers align their curricula across grade levels and within their subject area departments during their weekly meetings. Because every student comes to the school with his or her own strengths and challenges, the curricula and lessons provide modifications and interventions to address the needs of all students. Curriculum and lesson plans are kept in Google Docs.

During classroom visits, the CSO team observed students working either individually or in small groups. Students received a series of tasks to complete for each unit and teachers monitored student progress on these tasks. Most classes were co-taught and the collaboration between the two teachers in the room was evident in observed classrooms. All classrooms had essential questions and enduring understandings, relative to the lesson, displayed prominently. Many students were using technology to complete their tasks which added to the engagement the review team observed.

Instruction is data-driven to ensure that each student learns the content and skills needed to be successful in the class. The progress for Year 1 students is closely monitored through their work with Read 180 and Math 180. For content area classes, the tasks students complete reportedly always begin with a pre-assessment and end with a summative assessment where students are expected to show mastery of the content. During teacher meetings assessment results are analyzed and revisions to curricula and/or lessons are made. Interventions are also developed for individual students.

Classes are co-taught by two teachers, who work and plan closely together. The director of curriculum and instruction, the director of student support services, and the coordinator of special education/ELL also work closely together to review individual student data and address both the academic and the behavior needs of the students. Teachers are familiar with the Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for their students with disabilities and instruction is modified accordingly within each classroom. At UDTCS, teachers individualize instruction to provide support where needed. Communication between teachers and student support staff enables each adult to better understand the challenges and strengths of each student.

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. <i>Behavior Management and Safety</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <i>Family Engagement and Communication</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Teachers communicate with parents to discuss students’ strengths and needs. b. The school assesses family and student satisfaction using strategies such as surveys, feedback sessions, community forums, or participation logs, and considers results when making schoolwide decisions. c. The school has a systematic process for responding to parent or community concerns. d. The school shares school-level academic data with the broader school community to promote transparency and accountability among parents, students and school constituents.
3. <i>Social-Emotional Supports</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. School leaders collect and use data to track the socio-emotional needs of students. b. School leaders collect and use data regarding the impact of programs designed to support students’ social and emotional health.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 3:

Overall, the UDTCS has put systems into place to address the behavior management and safety of students while also supporting students’ social-emotional health.

Faculty and staff have established a restorative practices program to address discipline issues for all students, including those with disabilities. The program centers on “circles,” in which students meet with other students who they have conflicts with or who have violated the discipline policy.

The school has a large student support team, including a social worker for every year, who is trained in restorative practices. In addition to the social workers, students are also supported by a dean, an assistant dean, guidance counselors, the special education/ELL coordinator, and student support program assistants. In keeping with the sports-based theme of the school, every student has a coach with whom they meet daily for support and guidance. During classroom visits, the review team did not witness any substantial disruptions to instruction.

The school uses Jupiter, an online portal which tracks student level information in the areas of behavior, attendance, grades, and transcript information. This is available to parents as well as staff. Referrals are made via the Jupiter database, and the student support team reviews this information daily, intervening as necessary to address and track problems, challenges, interventions, and disciplinary actions with students. Information is tracked and analyzed for trends. As trends are noted, the school leaders and student support team adjust procedures and policies as required.

School staff communicates with families in a variety of ways, including newsletters and progress reports. Since attendance and tardiness are a challenge at the school, the student's coach contacts parents when the student is absent from school. There is an expectation by the school leaders that teachers will contact parents regularly with positive information about student achievement and/or behavior as well as any negative issues. Parent-teacher conferences are held three times a year to discuss academic and behavioral student progress.

Two parents attended the parent focus group during the visit. Both told reviewers that teachers and school leaders are responsive to their concerns. The school has a Parent Teacher Association that works with the administration to sponsor events at the school to increase family engagement. Additionally, there is a Parent and Community Coordinator and an Advisory Board consisting of staff members, members of the community, and parents. Information about the school is shared on the school's website and on flyers displayed around the school.

Benchmark 4: Financial Condition

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

Finding: Meets

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 4:

Financial Condition

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

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

Overall Financial Outlook

A *composite score* is an overall measure of financial health calculated by the Department's Office of Audit Services. This score is based on a weighting of primary reserves, equity, and net income. A charter school with a score between 1.5 and 3.0 is considered to be in strong financial health. UDTCS's composite score for 2015-2016 is 2.50. The table below shows the school's composite scores from 2012-2013 through 2015-2016.

**Urban Dove Team Charter School's Composite Scores
2012-2013 to 2015-2016**

<i>Year</i>	<i>Composite Score</i>
2015-2016	2.50
2014-2015	2.10
2013-2014	0.60
2012-2013	-0.70

Source: NYSED Office of Audit Services

Near Term Indicators

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

1. The *current ratio* is a financial ratio that measures whether a charter school has enough resources to pay its debts over the next 12 months. The ratio is mainly used to give an idea of the school's ability to pay back its short-term liabilities (debt and payables) with its short-term assets (cash, inventory, and receivables). The higher the current ratio, the more capable the school is of paying its obligations, with a ratio under 1.0 indicating concern. For 2015-2016, UDTCS had a current ratio of 1.7.
2. *Unrestricted cash* measures, in days, whether the charter school can meet operating expenses without receiving new income. Charter schools typically strive to maintain at least 90 days of cash on hand. For fiscal year 2015-2016, UDTCS operated with 91 days of unrestricted cash.

3. *Enrollment stability* measures whether a charter school is meeting its enrollment projections, thereby generating sufficient revenue to fund ongoing operations. Actual enrollment that is over 85 percent is considered reasonable. UDTCS's enrollment stability for 2015-2016 was 102 percent.

Long Term Indicators

A charter school's *debt to asset ratio* measures the extent to which the school relies on borrowed funds to finance its operations. It is calculated as total liabilities divided by total assets. A ratio of 0.9 or less meets a standard of low risk. For 2015-2016, UDTCS's debt to asset ratio was 0.4.

Total margin measures the deficit or surplus a charter school yields out of its total revenues; in other words, whether the school is living within its available resources. Total margin is calculated as net income divided by total revenue. A total margin that is positive indicates low risk. For 2015-2016, UDTCS's total margin was 10 percent.

Benchmark 5: Financial Management

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

Finding: Approaches

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 5:

The CSO reviewed UDTCS's 2015-2016 audited financial statements to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting.

The independent auditor issued a management letter regarding internal control-related matters identified in the audit. A "deficiency in internal controls" is defined as when the design or operation of an internal control does not allow school staff to prevent, detect, or correct misstatements in financial statements in a timely fashion. A "material weakness" is a deficiency or combination of deficiencies in internal controls that creates a reasonable possibility that school staff will not be allowed to prevent, detect, or correct material misstatements in financial statements in a timely fashion.

The auditor identified three issues believed to be significant deficiencies:

1. During review of per pupil billing to the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE), seven students' discharge dates did not match NYCDOE's records, resulting in a miscalculation of earned revenue.
2. Proof of residency is required for each student enrolled in the school, but it could not be located for six students out of 60 tested. This could have resulted in incorrect tuition rates being used to calculate per pupil billing.
3. As of October 24, 2016, the school could not produce an up-to-date certificate of occupancy or fire safety inspection report.

For the first two findings, the auditor recommended that a second person become involved in both tasks to check dates of enrollment and discharge as well as to review student files to ensure that proof of residency is part of each student's records. The auditor also recommended that the school obtain the fire safety inspection report on an annual basis.

In the school's board of trustees' response to the findings, it indicated that the auditor's recommendations regarding per pupil billing and proof of residency records had been implemented. However, despite efforts to resolve the issue, UDTCS has not yet been successful in providing a current, valid fire safety inspection report.

One outstanding issue also remains from the school's 2014-2015 audit. The auditor recommended that the board of trustees adopt a policy for operating reserves. The board had yet to do so at the time of the visit.

Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance

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

Finding: Meets

<i>Element</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
1. <i>Board Oversight and Governance</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. The board recruits and selects board members with skills and expertise that meet the needs of the school.b. The board engages in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting priorities and goals that are aligned with the school’s mission and educational philosophy.c. The board demonstrates active oversight of the charter school management, fiscal operations and progress toward meeting academic and other school goals.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 6:

While the UDTCS Board of Trustees is meeting many indicators in the benchmark, there are some areas of concern.

UDTCS has a seven-member board of trustees that includes founding members of the school. Board members have a range of skills and expertise that meet the needs of the school, including legal compliance, leadership, finance, human resources, and technology. Members bring their expertise to existing committees, which include governance, finance, and academic.

The UDTCS board reviews the school’s policies annually and makes needed adjustments to assure that policies are reasonable and effective, and comply with applicable laws, rules and regulations. During the site visit, the review team learned that the board had revised, adopted and implemented the discipline policy for the 2016-2017 school year without seeking the required authorizer approval. The board is reminded that changes in key school policies are considered a non-material revision to the school charter, and must be submitted to the authorizer for review and approval prior to implementation.

The school was founded in partnership with Urban Dove, a New York not-for-profit corporation. Urban Dove provides a variety of services to UDTCS including financial management and human resources management for the school, development and implementation of the SBYD program, professional development for school leadership and the board, additional support for the board, implementation of the College All-Stars and HiRisers programs and fundraising for UDTCS. Two Urban Dove board members also serve on the school’s board of trustees. They recuse themselves from discussions and decision-making when there is a possibility of a conflict of interest. The scope of the MOU between UDTCS and Urban Dove has increased to a level of providing comprehensive management services, as per [Definition of an Entity that Provides Comprehensive Management Services](#). As such, UDTCS is requesting approval of a material revision to the charter to enter a contract with Urban Dove, Inc. to provide comprehensive management services to the school.

The board receives monthly updates about the school from the school leader. This report includes data on current enrollment, staffing, partnerships, and student performance. The board also has access to data through the data dashboard. Additional information on the dashboard includes student demographics, student profiles, and disciplinary actions for the month. During the board focus group, however, trustee members were unable to report on areas of weakness or planned focus for the school's academic program and deferred the CSO team to school leadership.

The board of trustees annually evaluates the school leader. They solicit information about leadership from staff, via a short survey, the leadership team, coaches, and parents. The school leader has one-on-one meetings with the board to discuss results of the survey as well as, for example, the academic performance of students and the graduation rate. The school leader has both individual and schoolwide goals he must reach.

At present, the board does not have a strategic plan. In the board focus group, members describe their evaluation goals for school leadership to be a framework for their strategic plan.

The board evaluates itself with an individual online self-evaluation survey and discussions with Urban Dove, which provides leadership support. For professional development, individual members take part in webinars but members reported that there is no organized, external professional development or board retreat.

When the board members were asked about their interactions with the community, they reported on ways that they do outreach to recruit new students in multiple organizations including boys and girls' clubs and youth community service groups. When asked how they interacted with the school community, particularly how the school shared academic data, board members could not articulate this and again deferred to school leadership.

Benchmark 7: Organizational Capacity

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

Finding: Meets

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

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 7:

The school has an effective leadership team which consists of the school leader and several directors that report to him. They include directors of finance and human resources, operations, curriculum and instruction, student support services, athletics, and an assistant director of the school-based youth development program. An organization chart was provided that shows reporting lines. During conversations with the review team, it was apparent that individuals understood their own roles and

responsibilities. Directors and other staff understood the mission and goals of the school and stressed their student-focused approach.

Several mechanisms are in place to ensure that there is constant communication amongst the staff. The school leader told the review team that communication is one of the school's core values. To this end, he distributes a newsletter to staff every Friday and communicates to them via email daily. There are multiple meetings scheduled for every Friday including league (year) team meetings. League leaders meet with the school leader every two weeks and full staff meetings are held twice a month. Minutes are taken at all department meetings and shared in a Google Doc, where teachers are encouraged to make comments on the topics discussed. In addition, the director of curriculum and instruction meets individually with each teacher once a month.

The school has a thorough process for hiring teachers. School leadership reported in the focus group that vacancies are posted on several websites, although most candidates came as referrals from current staff. Candidates go through a multi-phase interview process that includes a phone interview, a panel interview, a demonstration lesson, and reference checking. New teachers serve a 90 day probationary period during which they are supported by coaches.

Although all subject area classes are described in the Renewal Application and site visit materials as co-taught by a content teacher and a special education teacher, only five of the school's 12 special education co-teachers hold certification in special education. Seven of the 12 teachers are uncertified. While the total number of uncertified teachers employed at UDTCS is within permissible limits under NYS Education Law, UDTCS should not use descriptions of their qualifications that could be considered misleading, and should seek appropriate training and certification for teachers that are responsible for meeting the IEP needs of its students.

This year the school has hired an instructional coach to support teachers with successful strategies in the classroom. The school leader and director of curriculum and instruction visit classrooms informally every day and provide feedback to teachers on an on-going basis. In addition, teachers attend workshops at the New York City Charter School Center and can pursue professional development opportunities on an individual basis as well. Every summer, prior to the start of school, teachers attend three weeks of meetings and workshops to receive professional development and develop curricula and lesson plans. This year, with the adoption of both Read 180 and Math 180 teachers have been involved in targeted professional development to learn more about implementing these two programs.

School leadership reported through a combination of the Renewal Application, document submissions and focus group responses that teachers are evaluated by the school leader, the director of curriculum and instruction, and the director of student support services at least once per trimester. Some areas on which teachers are evaluated include classroom environment, use of data, feedback to students, and preparation for class. An area of importance is collaboration with colleagues. Teachers can share their thoughts about the school during their weekly meetings with league leaders and department heads as well as through a survey which is administered once a trimester.

Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements

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

Finding: Meets

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

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 8:

All stakeholders with whom the review team met shared a common understanding of the mission of the school. The sports-based youth development program has been integrated into the academic classrooms as well as the sports-specific ones. Leadership skills and close, supportive relationships with adults acting as coaches are a part of the school's core structure.

The key design elements, such as the sports-based development program, are addressed through the school's overall academic and social emotional programs. The school has an extended schedule, provides opportunities for career development, has a large student support services team to address students' social and emotional health needs, as well as college guidance services. The sports-based youth development basis for the school and the college prep program are supported through the school's partnership with Urban Dove.

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: Exceeds

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

Table 4: Student Demographics – UDTCS Compared to CSD 13

	2014-15			2015-16			2016-17
	Percent of Enrollment		Variance ³	Percent of Enrollment		Variance	Percent of Enrollment
	School	CSD		School	CSD		School ⁴
Enrollment of Special Populations							
Economically Disadvantaged	69%	70%	-1	82%	66%	+16	73%
English Language Learners	3%	3%	0	2%	4%	-2	4%
Students with Disabilities	37%	7%	+30	39%	15%	+24	35%

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 9:

Over the duration of the charter term, UDTCS has essentially met or exceeded comparable enrollment percentages of special populations in CSD 13. The school received Board of Regents approval to increase

³ Variance is defined as the percent of subgroup enrollment between the charter school and the district of location.

⁴ Reported by the school; 2016-17 enrollment data has not been publicly released as of the date of this report.

its maximum approved enrollment to 265 students in 2016-2017. At the time of the renewal visit, the school was over-enrolled with a total student population of 281 students. School leadership reported that this was in anticipation of student attrition over the course of the year.

Recruitment efforts are reported in the 2015-2016 Annual Report and include strategies such as: meeting with the principals and academic deans in local CSD 13, 15, and other Brooklyn CSDs to identify struggling students in their demographic; mail and telephone campaigns to long-term absentees to introduce them to the school; and running several open houses community-based facilities to allow students and families to meet the school faculty and staff.

Some retention strategies used have been referred to in other portions of the report but they include social workers for each year, co-taught classrooms with special education teachers and a general education classroom teacher, and customized programming tailored to students learning needs.

Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance

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

Finding: Approaches

<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
1. <i>Legal Compliance</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. The school has compiled a record of substantial compliance with applicable state and federal laws and the provisions of its charter including, but not limited to: those related to student admissions and enrollment; FOIL and Open Meetings Law; protecting the rights of students and employees; financial management and oversight; governance and reporting; and health and safety requirements.b. The school has undertaken appropriate corrective action when needed, and has implemented necessary safeguards to maintain compliance with all legal requirements.c. The school has sought Board of Regents and/or Charter School Office approval for significant revisions.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 10:

While UDTCS appears to comply with most applicable laws, regulations, and provisions of its charter, there are some areas of improvement. The school should provide evidence of a current fire safety inspection of all floors and areas used by the school. When revisions are considered for school policies or other charter documents, they must be submitted to the CSO review and approval prior to implementation, in compliance with the [Charter School Revision Guidance](#).

APPENDIX A: ASSESSMENT AND GRADUATION OUTCOMES

Table 5: UDTCS Self-Reported Graduation Rates for Overaged/Under-Credited for Similar Students Citywide

Class of 2015	% of Cohort	Peer Target Graduation Rate	UD Team Rate to Date
15 years old, less than 11	48.5%	30%	61%
16 years old, less than 11, no Regents	32%	27%	41%
16 years old, less than 11, one or more Regents	7.5%	28%	40%
Other OA/UC categories	9%	30%	33%
Non Overage/Under-credited	3%	67%	100%
Non-Dropout Rate		55%	59%

Class of 2016	% of Cohort	Peer Target Graduation Rate	UD Team Rate to Date
15 years old, less than 11	39%	30%	47%
16 years old, less than 11, no Regents	34%	27%	12%
16 years old, less than 11, one or more Regents	10%	28%	25%
Other OA/UC categories	8%	30%	67%
Non Overage/Under-credited	9%	67%	85%
Non-Dropout Rate		55%	62.5%

Table 6: UDTCS Self-Reported Graduation Rates for Overaged/Under-Credited by DOE Designation

Class of 2015	% of Cohort	Peer Target Graduation Rate	UD Team Rate to Date
15 year old UD Team OA/UC	48.5%	30%	61%
DOE Most At-Risk OA/UC	35.5%	27%	38%
DOE Other OA/UC	10%	28%	43%
Non OA/UC	6%	67%	75%
Non-Dropout Rate		55%	59%

Class of 2016	% of Cohort	Peer Target Graduation Rate	UD Team Rate to Date
15 year old UD Team OA/UC	39%	30%	47%
DOE Most At-Risk OA/UC	35.5%	27%	15%
DOE Other OA/UC	14%	28%	36%
Non OA/UC	11.5%	67%	66.5%
Non-Dropout Rate		55%	62.5%

Note: The tables below are a standard component of all Renewal Site Visit Reports. Additional information about the school's academic outcomes is included in Benchmark 1 text.

Table 7: UDTCS Annual Regents Outcomes – Aggregate

	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
	UDTCS	NYS	UDTCS	NYS	UDTCS	NYS
Comprehensive English	35%	82%	25%	83%	18%	53%
English Language Arts (Common Core)	52%	74%	33%	80%	34%	87%
Integrated Algebra (>65)	21%	72%	21%	62%	55%	58%
Algebra I (Common Core) (levels 3, 4 & 5)	3%	68%	2%	63%	16%	72%
Geometry (>65)	0%	N/A	33%	72%	0%	38%
Living Environment (>65)	38%	78%	23%	77%	38%	78%
Physical Setting/Earth Science (>65)	N/A	N/A	20%	72%	14%	71%
US History and Government	7%	80%	17%	84%	21%	82%
Global History and Geography (>65)	8%	N/A	17%	67%	28%	68%

*Testing number too small; no results reported on NYS School Report Card

N/A =no students sat for exams therefore no comparison made

Table 8: UDTCS Annual Regents Outcomes – Economically Disadvantaged

	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
	UDTCS	NYS	UDTCS	NYS	UDTCS	NYS
Comprehensive English	32%	75%	28%	75%	0%	50%
English Language Arts (Common Core)	57%	66%	34%	73%	35%	80%
Integrated Algebra (>65)	25%	64%	22%	58%	60%	57%
Algebra I (Common Core) (levels 3, 4 & 5)	5%	54%	0%	48%	18%	62%
Geometry (>65)	*	N/A	*	N/A	*	N/A
Living Environment (>65)	38%	69%	24%	68%	*	N/A
Physical Setting/Earth Science (>65)	N/A	N/A	18%	59%	15%	57%
US History and Government	5%	70%	18%	76%	18%	74%
Global History and Geography (>65)	7%	N/A	18%	56%	27%	73%

*Testing number too small; no results reported on NYS School Report Card

N/A =no students sat for exams therefore no comparison made

Table 9: UDTCS Annual Regents Outcomes – Students with Disabilities

	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
	UDTCS	NYS	UDTCS	NYS	UDTCS	NYS
Comprehensive English	13%	52%	32%	54%	17%	35%
English Language Arts (Common Core)	33%	40%	18%	49%	14%	61%
Integrated Algebra (>65)	16%	41%	6%	39%	14%	34%
Algebra I (Common Core) (levels 3, 4 & 5)	6%	30%	0%	26%	15%	41%
Geometry (>65)	N/A	N/A	*	N/A	*	21%
Living Environment (>65)	33%	48%	0%	46%	40%	54%
Physical Setting/Earth Science (>65)	N/A	N/A	19%	42%	0%	40%
US History and Government	0%	50%	4%	56%	23%	70%
Global History and Geography (>65)	11%	33%	14%	34%	7%	36%

*Testing number too small; no results reported on NYS School Report Card

N/A =no students sat for exams

Table 10: UDTCS Annual Regents Outcomes – English Language Learners

	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
	UDTCS	NYS	UDTCS	NYS	UDTCS	NYS
Comprehensive English	*	N/A	*	N/A	*	N/A
English Language Arts (Common Core)	N/A	N/A	*	N/A	*	N/A
Integrated Algebra (>65)	20%	50%	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Algebra I (Common Core) (levels 3, 4 & 5)	*	N/A	*	N/A	*	N/A
Geometry (>65)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Living Environment (>65)	*	N/A	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Physical Setting/Earth Science (>65)	N/A	N/A	*	N/A	*	N/A
US History and Government	N/A	N/A	0%	52%	*	N/A
Global History and Geography (>65)	*	N/A	*	N/A	*	N/A

*Testing number too small; no results reported on NYS School Report Card
 N/A =no students sat for exams therefore no comparison made

**Table 11: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes for All Students:
 School, District & NYS Level Aggregates**

4-Yr Cohort: All Students	2010 Cohort			2011 Cohort			2012 Cohort		
	Subject	School	Variance	State	School	Variance	State	School	Variance
ELA	21%	-61%	82%	36%	-48%	84%	35%	-49%	84%
Math	29%	-55%	84%	33%	-53%	86%	39%	-47%	86%
Global History	4%	-74%	78%	16%	-63%	79%	19%	-59%	78%
US History	4%	-75%	79%	18%	-63%	81%	19%	-62%	81%
Science	21%	-62%	83%	23%	-61%	84%	30%	-54%	84%
Graduation Rate Target	4%	-72%	76%	11%	-69%	80%	18%	-62%	80%

**Table 12: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes by Subgroup – Economically Disadvantaged Students:
 School, District & NYS Level Aggregates**

4-Yr Cohort: Economically Disadvantaged	2010 Cohort			2011 Cohort			2012 Cohort		
	Subject	School	Variance	State	School	Variance	State	School	Variance
ELA	12%	-63%	75%	38%	-40%	78%	38%	-41%	79%
Math	29%	-50%	79%	33%	-48%	81%	45%	-36%	81%
Global History	0%	-70%	70%	17%	-54%	71%	21%	-49%	70%
US History	0%	-72%	72%	18%	-56%	74%	17%	-57%	74%
Science	18%	-58%	76%	23%	-55%	78%	30%	-48%	78%
Graduation Rate Target	0%	-80%	80%	12%	-68%	80%	17%	-63%	80%

**Table 13: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes by Subgroup – Students with Disabilities:
School, District & NYS Level Aggregates**

4-Yr Cohort: Students with Disabilities	2010 Cohort			2011 Cohort			2012 Cohort		
	Subject	School	Variance	State	School	Variance	State	School	Variance
ELA	0%	-43%	43%	17%	-32%	49%	21%	-30%	51%
Math	17%	-29%	46%	14%	-36%	50%	18%	-33%	51%
Global History	0%	-39%	39%	6%	-34%	40%	15%	-25%	40%
US History	0%	-42%	42%	3%	-43%	46%	12%	-35%	47%
Science	17%	-31%	48%	8%	-41%	49%	24%	-26%	50%
Graduation Rate Target	0%	-80%	80%	0%	-80%	80%	21%	-59%	80%

**Table 14: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes by Subgroup – English Language Learners:
School, District & NYS Level Aggregates**

4-Yr Cohort: English Language Learners	2010 Cohort			2011 Cohort			2012 Cohort		
	Subject	School	Variance	State	School	Variance	State	School	Variance
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	-41%	41%	*	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	-56%	56%	*	N/A	N/A
Global History	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	-35%	35%	*	N/A	N/A
US History	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	-41%	41%	*	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	-43%	43%	*	N/A	N/A
Graduation Rate Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	-80%	80%	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Testing number too small; no results reported on NYS School Report Card
N/A =no students sat for exams therefore no comparison made

**Memorandum
Via Electronic Transmission**

May 19, 2017

To: Michael Grandis, Board Chair of Urban Dove Team Charter School
Amit Bahl, Charter School Leader of Urban Dove Team Charter School
Jai Nanda, Executive Director of Urban Dove

From: Nicole Henderson, NYSED Charter School Office School Liaison

Subject: Factual Corrections to October 2016 Renewal Site Visit Report

The CSO has reviewed the factual corrections submitted by the school. Attached is the finalized version of the Urban Dove Team Charter School site visit report with modifications. At this time, the school may provide evaluative comments or responses to SED findings along with supporting evidence that will be posted with the report, now in its final form.

To develop a shared understanding of why the final report includes some, but not all, elements mentioned in Urban Dove Team Charter School's factual correction letter, the CSO is providing clarifications on some of the revisions requested by the school. Specifically:

- While the CSO acknowledges that the review of this report was delayed, it should also be noted that Urban Dove Team Charter School was given an extension to submit Benchmark 1 and has been continually working in collaboration with the CSO to ensure accuracy. Typically, the CSO does not permit additional time for schools to submit data beyond the October deadline, however, as a courtesy to the school due to its unique evaluation and model, data was permitted to be submitted and used with a January 2017 submission. This contributed to the delay.
- Item #3, Note 2
On page 9 in Benchmark 1 of the Mid-Term Site Visit Report dated May 27, 2015, it states:
...Urban Dove Team CS's Regents exam proficiency rate is considerably below the NYC and state averages. The Charter School Office will continue to monitor the school's progress and is refining specific metrics and comparability analyses that can be used to compare Urban Dove Team CS with other schools that serve over-aged, under-credited students. **The comparison analysis will supplement, not supplant, the Performance Framework analysis** [emphasis added]. If Urban Dove Team CS does not meet or come close to meeting student performance indicators for over-aged under-credited students over the remaining charter term, the school will be at risk of short-term or non-renewal of the charter.

The CSO is unable to make changes to previous reports that have already memorialized this information.

- Item #5 (the first one), Note 1

This data was provided to the CSO by Urban Dove Team Charter School in the January 2017 submission of Benchmark 1 data. It was copied and pasted from the document, which was sent by the school, titled "Accountability Plan Summary Class of 2015 and 2016."

- Item #5 (the second one), Note 1

The CSO is obligated to evaluate the school based on the standards and goals set forth in the charter application written by the school, the charter agreement, and the CSO's Performance Framework. The appendix the school refers to is reporting data relevant to the commitments made in Urban Dove Team Charter School's charter application. These include the following statements in the charter application:

- "Students are expected to take and pass all Regents exams required for graduation and the curriculum will be mapped and interim assessments will be administered with these requirements in mind." – page 3
- Under "D. Assessment," where "Teacher Accountability for Student Results" evaluation criteria is outlined, the last criteria is listed as "Regents passing rates and credit accumulation is comparable to our sister transfer schools in their first year." – page 14
- Also in Section D., the following statement is made, "With a goal of excellence, however, all Urban Dove Charter school students will achieve the standards of a full Regents diploma and most will excel with scores high enough to exempt them from remedial college courses."
- Promotion criteria on page 17 cites the requirement that students pass at least one Regents exam, depending on their year.
- Graduation requirements on page 18 require "Passage of at least five Regents examinations: English, Mathematics, Science, Global History & Geography, U.S. History & Government."

The CSO encourages Urban Dove Team Charter School to work with this office to think through charter revisions that may need to be made during the next charter term. Thank you for your continued work with us. If you have any evaluative comments or a response to SED findings, we will need these documents by June 2, 2017 to include them with the final renewal site visit report.

cc: Susan Megna
David Frank
Karonne Jarrett-Watson