

DELAWARE DESIGN-LAB HIGH SCHOOL

ANNUAL REPORT

2016-2017

**179 Stanton Christiana Rd,
Newark, DE 19702**

Phone:(302) 292-5450

I. OVERVIEW

1.1 School Overview:

Review the following chart with the school's basic information. (Note: This table will be completed by the Charter School Office. Please review for accuracy. **Any changes identified by the team must be highlighted in red prior to submitting the report. Only changes highlighted in red will be reviewed by the Charter School Office. Should there be no highlighted changes, the data will appear as presented in this draft.**)

BASIC INFORMATION	
Name of School	Delaware Design Lab High School
Year School Opened	2015
Enrollment 2016-2017 ¹	272
Approved Enrollment	350
School Address	179 Stanton Christiana Rd, Newark, DE 19702
District(s) of Residence	Colonial School District
Website Address	http://www.ddlhs.org/
Name of School Leader	Rebecca Collins
School Leader Email and Phone Number	Rebecca.Collins@design-lab.k12.de.us (302) 292-5450
Name of Board President	Paul Miller
Mission Statement: Our mission is to: Delight students with education beyond imagination in the most innovative school on the planet.	

1.2 School Demographic

Data:

Please review the following table for accuracy and complete the second row (“# of Students on Waiting List”) for 2016-2017. (Note: The remaining sections of the table will be completed by the Charter School Office. **Any changes identified by the team must be highlighted in red prior to submitting the report. Only changes highlighted in red will be reviewed by the Charter School Office. Should there be no highlighted changes, the data will appear as presented in this draft.**)

ENROLLMENT & DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION	
	2016-2017 ¹
Total Enrollment	272
# of Students on Waiting List	
Gender	
% Male	59.19%
% Female	40.81%
Ethnicity/Race	
% African American	48.90%
% American Indian	
% Asian	2.21%
% Hispanic/Latino	11.76%
% White	36.76%
% Multiracial	0.37%
Special Populations	
%Special Education ²	25.00%
% English Language Learners	2.21%
% Low-Income	38.97%

Schools are invited but not required to comment on any aspect of the demographic data above in table 1.2

1.3 Approved Minor and Major Modifications:

The table lists any approved minor and/or major modifications over the course of the school’s current charter term.

(Note: This table will be completed by the Charter School Office. Please review the following table for accuracy. **Any changes identified by the team must be highlighted in red prior to submitting the report. Only changes highlighted in red will be reviewed by the Charter School Office. Should there be no highlighted changes, the data will appear as presented in this draft.**)

Date	Modification Requested	Outcome
Apr 2017	Minor - • Update organizational structure • Align language throughout charter for consistency • Clarify and explain governance and management structures and the school’s historical relationship with Design Lab Schools LLC.	Approved

Schools are invited but not required to comment on any aspect of the demographic data above in table 1.3

1.4 School Enrollment:

Please review the following chart with the school’s enrollment trends during the current term of the charter. (This table will be completed by the Charter School Office. Please review for accuracy. **Any changes identified by the team must be highlighted in red prior to submitting the report. Only changes highlighted in red will be reviewed by the Charter School Office. Should there be no highlighted changes, the data will appear as presented in this draft.**)

School Enrollment Trends		
<i>Cells highlighted in grey were grade levels not serviced by this school</i>		
	2016-2017	
	Approved Enrollment	30-Sep Enrollment Count
K		
Grade 1		
Grade 2		
Grade 3		
Grade 4		
Grade 5		
Grade 6		
Grade 7		
Grade 8		
Grade 9	124	76
Grade 10	133	132
Grade 11	93	64
Grade 12		
Total	350	272

Schools are invited but not required to comment on any aspect of the enrollment data above in table 1.4.

1.5 Reenrollment:

Reenrollment Rate² is the % of students continuously enrolled in the school from one year to the next.

Review the following chart with the school’s reenrollment trends during the current charter term. (This table will be completed by the Charter School Office. Please review for accuracy. **Any changes identified by the team must be highlighted in red prior to submitting the report. Only changes highlighted in red will be reviewed by the Charter School Office. Should there be no highlighted changes, the data will appear as presented in this draft.**)

School Reenrollment Trends		
Cells highlighted in grey were grade levels not serviced by this school		
	Delaware Design Lab	
	Number of Students Reenrolled Count	Percentage of Students Reenrolled %
K		
Grade 1		
Grade 2		
Grade 3		
Grade 4		
Grade 5		
Grade 6		
Grade 7		
Grade 8		
Grade 9**	7	
Grade 10	107	78.68%
Grade 11	56	57.73%
Grade 12		
Total/Avg	170	72.96%

** School entry grade level. Reenrollment data not collected for this grade level.

Describe the school's plans to monitor and minimize attrition rates. Provide information about why students are choosing to enroll in different schools.

DDLHS does not believe the data presented above is accurate. As of September 30, 2016, the following table represents the number of students grades 10, 11, and 12, who had been continuously enrolled at DDLHS since the prior year.

[Insert table]

The data above reflects retention rates for students who enrolled at DDLHS during its first year of operation. DDLHS believes two major factors contributed to the retention rates listed. First, as a charter school that had not yet opened, all students reflected in this data enrolled in DDLHS based solely upon the explanation of school representatives regarding the school's culture, philosophy, and pedagogical approach. At the time of enrollment, DDLHS did not yet have a reputation in the community upon which students could determine fit, both culturally and academically. Because DDLHS utilizes and innovative model centered on student-voice and design thinking, students accustomed to more traditional learning environments may have experienced some discomfort or confusion during DDLHS's first year in operation and elected to enroll in a more traditional setting the following year. Additionally, the data shows that retention rates for those who entered DDLHS in the 9th grade far exceed the rate of those who entered DDLHS in the 10th grade (i.e., who already completed one year of high school at a different school). Given this discrepancy, DDLHS submits that students who entered in the 10th grade already had switched schools once (having transferred from a different high school) and were more apt to exercise the option to switch schools again for whatever reason.

DDLHS intends to minimize attrition rates by minimizing changes at the administrative level, continuing its academic and cultural successes, and working to ensure students who enroll understand the pedagogical approach utilized within the school. DDLHS anticipates retention rates for the 2016-2017 school year may still be lower than desired, but following its 3rd full year of operation (data taken in the fall of 2018) attrition rates will be significantly reduced.

II. ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

2.1 Delaware School Success Framework

Overall Academic Ratings

Metrics	Delaware School Success Framework (DSSF)
	2016-2017
Academic Achievement	2 Stars (31/125pts) Needs Improvement
Growth	3 Stars (99/225pts) Approaching
On Track to Graduation	4 Stars (61/100pts) Meets Standard
College and Career Preparation	0 Stars (-1/50pts)

Note: Please utilize the hyperlinks in this sentence for more information about the [Academic Performance Framework](#) or the [Delaware School Success Framework \(DSSF\)](#)

- a) Based on the table above discuss the school’s:
 ?????????????????? overall academic achievement results,
 ?????????????????? major challenges,
 ?????????????????? and accomplishments over the course of the
 school year.

School Comments:

DDLHS believes that the school’s overall academic (i) achievement results, (ii) major challenges, and (iii) accomplishments are discussed thoroughly in other sections of this Annual Report.

Performance Agreement

Academic Performance Expectations

By 2017, our expectation is to achieve the overall rating of "Meets" or "Exceeds" standard as measured by the Academic Performance Framework. Each year, we will show growth within our overall rating putting us on track to achieve our academic performance expectations. This progress will be monitored through our annual performance review.

- a) Discuss the school's academic performance based on its approved Performance Agreement (see above).

School Comments:

DDLHS did not have State assessment data for SY2015-2016 because there were no students in any tested grade levels during the school's first year of operation. In SY2015-2016, DDLHS opened with 9th and 10th grade, and added a new grade each year thereafter. DDLHS currently serves grades 9-12, and this school year (SY2016-2017) was the first year that State results will be available since this is the first year the school had 11th grade students.

Although there is no state-reported data from SY2015-2016, DDLHS does have several measures that have been used to guide academic growth, with MAP scores being the most instructive.

MAP scores have served as a benchmark for students and have helped to institute changes for academics. Data shows that in the first year of operation, DDLHS was not particularly successful at increasing academic performance across a variety of subject matters.

9th Grade SY15-16

	Mean	DDLHS	Expected Growth	Actual Growth	Did Growth Exceed Target	Points deficient
Math			3.1	1.5	NO	
Fall	230.3	220.8				-9.5
Spring	233.4	222.3				-11.1
Reading			1.7	-3.7	NO	
Fall	220.2	220.6				0.4
Spring	221.9	216.9				-5
Language Usage			2	0.1	NO	
Fall	218.4	215.1				-3.3
Spring	220.4	215.2				-5.2

10th Grade SY15-16

	Mean	DDLHS	Expected Growth	Actual Growth	Did Growth Exceed Target	Points Deficient
Math			2.3	-2.1	NO	
Fall	230.1	222.4				-7.7
Spring	232.4	220.3				-12.1
Reading			0.7	-3.1	NO	
Fall	220.4	219.8				-0.6
Spring	221.2	216.7				-4.5
Language Usage			1.2	-2.4	NO	
Fall	218.9	216				-2.9
Spring	220.1	213.6				-6.5

By its second year of operation, however, DDLHS students were significantly exceeding normative achievement goals in Math and Language Usage. If these growth trends continue in Math and Language Usage, DDLHS students should collectively reach or exceed academic norms in these areas within 3 years of enrollment at DDLHS.

9th Grade SY16-17

	Mean	DDLHS	Expected Growth	Actual Growth	Did Growth Exceed Target	Points deficient
Math			3.1	3.7	YES	
Fall	230.3	221				-9.3
Spring	233.4	224.7				-8.7
Reading			1.7	1.1	NO	
Fall	220.2	216.5				-3.7
Spring	221.9	217.6				-4.3
Language Usage			2	2.8	YES	
Fall	218.4	214.8				-3.6
Spring	220.4	217.6				-2.8

10th Grade SY16-17

	Mean	DDLHS	Expected Growth	Actual Growth	Did Growth Exceed Target	Points Deficient	Growth over same time last year
Math			2.3	6.1	YES		
Fall	230.1	220.2				-9.9	-0.4
Spring	232.4	226.3				-6.1	5
Reading			0.7	-2.1	NO		
Fall	220.4	217.4				-3	-3.4
Spring	221.2	215.3				-5.9	-0.9
Language Usage			1.2	1.2	YES		
Fall	218.9	214.9				-4	-0.7
Spring	220.1	216.1				-4	1.2

**Data not adjusted for student by student enrollment changes.

11th Grade SY16-17

	Mean	DDLHS	Expected Growth	Actual Growth	Did Growth Exceed Target	Points Deficient	Cohort Growth over same time last year**
Math			1.7	1.9	YES		
Fall	233.3	225.3				-8	-0.3
Spring	235	227.2				-7.8	4.3
Reading			-0.3	-4.6	NO		
Fall	222.6	219.7				-2.9	-2.3
Spring	222.3	215.1				-7.2	-2.7
Language Usage			0.6	2.4	YES		
Fall	221.5	215.3				-6.2	-3.3
Spring	222.1	217.7				-4.4	2.1

**Data not adjusted for student by student enrollment changes.

Based on this data, DDLHS recognizes that it needs the most school-wide improvement in Reading and is establishing systems and instructional techniques aimed at increasing student achievement in this area. Specifically, DDLHS operates on a block schedule, allowing students currently in 12th grade to earn more than one credit of English in a year, thus allowing certain students to obtain two years' worth of English credits in a single year. DDLHS also has segregated an hour, 3 times per week, for guided instruction in areas of student need as identified by their individual test scores. DDLHS anticipates that these collective efforts will improve the MAP scores in reading, while the school continues to reach its growth targets in Math and Language Usage.

2.2 Academic Achievement/Proficiency Data

Academic Achievement	Delaware School Success Framework (DSSF)	
	2016-2017	
Rating	2 Stars (31/125pts) Needs Improvement	
	School	State
ELA	36.36 %	56.63%
Math	12.73%	45.13%
Science	24.51%	47.45%
Social Studies	n/a	n/a

Note: Please utilize the hyperlinks in this sentence for more information about the [Academic Performance Framework](#) or the [Delaware School Success Framework \(DSSF\)](#).

The table above lists the school's available DSSF Academic Achievement ratings.

Respond to the following questions.

- a) Based on the school's Academic Achievement ratings over the course of the charter term, discuss the school's current performance and provide explanations/root causes (positive and negative) for the results. Please include local assessment data if applicable.

School Comments:

Proficiency in ELA: *The data utilized to create the Academic Achievement rating for the 2016-2017 school year incorporates data from a single cohort of students. Of the 45 students tested, 39 of the students (87%) were in their second year of enrollment at DDLHS (Cohort A). Based upon previous year's data, 69% of Cohort A increased their ELA Score. On average, a student from Cohort A increased their ELA score by 86 points, which is three times more than the expected yearly growth on the SAT as projected by the College Board. At this rate of growth, 64% of students will reach the ELA benchmark*

score by their graduation date, which is 7% higher than the state average, despite only 42% of students scoring at the proficient level or higher when they entered DDLHS.

Proficiency in Math: The data utilized to create the Academic Achievement rating for the 2016-2017 school year incorporates data from a single cohort of students. Of the 45 students tested, 39 of the students (87%) were in their second year of enrollment at DDLHS (Cohort A). Based upon previous year's data, 56% of Cohort A increased their Math Score. On average, a student from Cohort A increased their Math score by 88 points, which is three times more than the expected yearly growth on the SAT as projected by the College Board. If this rate continues, 41% of students will reach the Math benchmark score by their graduation date, which is only 4% less than the state average. This is due to the large percentage of students who entered the school scoring below proficient in Math (greater than 85%).

Proficiency in Science: The data utilized to create the Academic Achievement rating for the 2016-2017 school year also incorporates data from a single cohort of students. 100% of the students tested were in their first year of enrollment at DDLHS. DDLHS does not have data showing the proficiency rates of the students at the point of enrollment, so it is unable to calculate growth. Based on the data presented for ELA and Math, however, DDLHS submits that the scores likely reflect substantial growth from a below-proficiency entry point and that DDLHS will be able to prove an increase science proficiency in this, and future, cohorts of students correlated to length of enrollment at DDLHS.

Based on this data, DDLHS believes that one root cause of the failure to meet standard in this area is the combination of (i) the number of tested students who enrolled at DDLHS well below state-proficiency levels and (ii) the short period of time (less than 2 years at the time of testing) these students were at DDLHS. Specifically, each of the students tested had been enrolled in other educational settings for the majority, if not all, of his or her formal education. Raising proficiency scores from well-below standard to above benchmark in 1 or 2 years for these students, especially in the first years of a school's operation, is not realistic. Given this information, DDLHS believes that the growth measures identified in Section 2.3 hereof are a more appropriate measure of the success of its educational program.

b) Looking ahead, what are your expected outcomes for Academic Achievement and what steps will you take to achieve them?

School Comments:

Given the above findings regarding growth in Math, Language Usage, and Reading, DDLHS expect to see a significant growth in proficiency among 11th and 12th grade

students by the end of FY 2018. To accomplish these goals, DDLHS will continue utilizing its pedagogical approach of learning through design thinking. We also have implemented the use of personalized instruction in Math through Kahn Academy, and in English and Science through block scheduling, small group instruction, and individual tutoring during Design Lab Hour and club time.

c) Describe how you will measure progress to determine whether you are on track to meet your expected Academic Achievement outcomes?

School Comments:

DDLHS will utilize a tiered approach to assessment and intervention, beginning with initial assessment through Measures of Academic Performance ("MAP") in the fall and winter before administration of the DCAS Alt-1 assessments in the Spring. Upon receipt of the assessment data in the fall, DDLHS will identify Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 level students in each of the tested content areas. DDLHS will re-evaluate this data, in conjunction with classroom data, regularly throughout each semester to identify students who may be struggling with their course work. DDLHS incorporates scheduled time each day for students at all levels to receive specific instruction and/or remediation in areas of need, or for students to pursue personal educational goals if all basic proficiencies are met. During this dedicated hour, DDLHS will utilize its internal RTI approaches (Kahn Academy, small group learning, peer coaching, etc.) to increase proficiency in the tested areas. DDLHS will reassess the success of its RTI program in the winter with a second administration of the MAP test and adjust as appropriate to ensure increased proficiency on the DCAS Alt-1 assessment.

2.3 Growth Data

Note: Please utilize the hyperlinks in this sentence for more information about the [Academic Performance Framework](#) or the [Delaware School Success Framework \(DSSF\)](#).

Academic Achievement	Delaware School Success Framework (DSSF)	
	2016-2017	
Rating	3 Stars (99/225pts) Approaching	
	School	State
ELA	46.83 %	50.00 %
Math	41.17 %	50.00 %

The table above lists the school's available DSSF Growth ratings.

Respond to the following questions.

- a) Based on the school's Growth ratings for all students over the course of the school year, discuss the school's current performance and provide at least three explanations/root causes for the results (Note: We invite the school to provide information about all students including those below, at and above proficiency.)

School Comments:

As stated above, DDLHS did not have any data to report in the 2015-16 school years. The achievement data in SY16-17 in the areas of ELA and Math was determined by the SAT data of a single cohort of students, 100% of whom had been enrolled at DDLHS for less than 2 years at the time of testing. Unfortunately, DDLHS is unable to clearly identify the source of the data used to assess this measure.

DDLHS has used internal assessment data, however, to show that in SY16-17 students significantly exceeded normative growth goals in Math and Language Usage

9th Grade SY16-17 – CHART A

	Mean	DDLHS	Expected Growth	Actual Growth	Did Growth Exceed Target	Points deficient
Math			3.1	3.7	YES	
<i>Fall</i>	230.3	221				-9.3
<i>Spring</i>	233.4	224.7				-8.7
Reading			1.7	1.1	NO	
<i>Fall</i>	220.2	216.5				-3.7
<i>Spring</i>	221.9	217.6				-4.3
Language Usage			2	2.8	YES	
<i>Fall</i>	218.4	214.8				-3.6
<i>Spring</i>	220.4	217.6				-2.8

10th Grade SY16-17 – CHART B

	Mean	DDLHS	Expected Growth	Actual Growth	Did Growth Exceed Target	Points Deficient	Growth over same time last year
Math			2.3	6.1	YES		
<i>Fall</i>	230.1	220.2				-9.9	-0.4
<i>Spring</i>	232.4	226.3				-6.1	5
Reading			0.7	-2.1	NO		
<i>Fall</i>	220.4	217.4				-3	-3.4
<i>Spring</i>	221.2	215.3				-5.9	-0.9
Language Usage			1.2	1.2	YES		
<i>Fall</i>	218.9	214.9				-4	-0.7
<i>Spring</i>	220.1	216.1				-4	1.2

**Data not adjusted for student by student enrollment changes.

11th Grade SY16-17 – CHART C

	Mean	DDLHS	Expected Growth	Actual Growth	Did Growth Exceed Target	Points Deficient	Cohort Growth over same time last year**
Math			1.7	1.9	YES		
Fall	233.3	225.3				-8	-0.3
Spring	235	227.2				-7.8	4.3
Reading			-0.3	-4.6	NO		
Fall	222.6	219.7				-2.9	-2.3
Spring	222.3	215.1				-7.2	-2.7
Language Usage			0.6	2.4	YES		
Fall	221.5	215.3				-6.2	-3.3
Spring	222.1	217.7				-4.4	2.1

**Data not adjusted for student by student enrollment changes.

Explanations:

- 1) *DDLHS believes the failure to achieve growth targets in SY2015-2016 relates directly to the fact that it was the school's first year of operation. In addition to focusing on academic achievement, a thinly staffed leadership team focused on all the mandates required to run a newly formed school including (i) teacher onboarding and training in the design thinking process, (ii) facilities issues, (iii) compliance with Federal, State, and local mandates, and (iv) operational matters such as the creation of human resources, financial, reporting, and other systems. Additionally, all students reflected in this data enrolled in DDLHS based solely upon the explanation of school representatives regarding the school's culture, philosophy, and pedagogical approach. At the time of enrollment, DDLHS did not yet have a reputation in the community upon which students could determine fit, both culturally and academically. Because DDLHS utilizes an innovative model centered on student-voice and design thinking, students accustomed to more traditional learning environments may have experienced some discomfort or confusion during DDLHS's first year in operation and may not have absorbed content in a manner that reflected positively on standardized tests.*
- 2) *DDLHS attributes its success in Math and Language Usage growth in its second year of operation to two factors. First, having operated one full year, leadership was more fully able to focus on academic growth instead of operational concerns. The school was able to institute more targeted professional development, RTI programs, and other systems designed to improve student achievement. Additionally, from exit surveys conducted at the end of SY15-16, the leadership team determined that a primary driver of student retention was the quality of teachers in the math department. Accordingly, in SY16-17, DDLHS focused intently on highly qualified math teachers with strong teaching skills and a solid understanding of the design thinking process. The success of these instructors is evident in the student growth seen in math during SY16-17.*

3) *The last column in Charts B and C shows the decrease or increase in total points from one year to the next in the fall and spring testing windows. DDLHS attributes decreases in this metric across all grades during the fall testing window to “summer slide.” The substantial increases in year over year growth by Spring, however, are notable. DDLHS attributes this success to the unique, hands-on way content is taught at the school.*

b) Looking ahead, what are your expected outcomes for Growth for all students and what steps will you take to achieve them?

School Comments:

As set forth above, DDLHS students far exceeded expected growth targets in Math and Language Usage based on MAP testing. This information is consistent with the data provided in Section 2.2(a) hereof regarding growth in SAT scores. If these growth trends, DDLHS believes that its academic program provides the proper scaffolding to allow students to achieve academic norms and/or proficiency in core subject areas within 3 years of enrollment at DDLHS.

DDLHS expects the growth trajectories identified in Math and Language Usage, and as seen in the SAT data, to continue in the current school year at the same, or increased, rates. DDLHS expects the downward growth trajectory in Reading identified on the school’s MAP scores to reverse as a result of, inter alia, increased length of enrollment of the cohort tested, increased RTIs and other resources provided to students in need, and increased teacher development in content and design thinking.

c) Describe how you will measure progress to determine whether you are on track to meet your expected Growth outcomes for all students.

School Comments:

DDLHS measures classroom performance four times per year and utilizes the data to identify students in need of additional assistance. DDLHS also formally assesses its students in the winter with a second administration of the MAP test and adjusts instructional goals as appropriate to ensure increased proficiency on the DCAS Alt-1 assessments.

2.4 On Track to Graduation Data

Note: Please utilize the hyperlinks in this sentence for more information about the [Academic Performance Framework](#) or the [Delaware School Success Framework \(DSSF\)](#).

On Track to Graduation	Delaware School Success Framework (DSSF)	
	2016-2017	
Rating	4 Stars (61/100pts) Meets Standard	
	School	State
Attendance	**	94.75 %
On-Track in the 9th grade	61.41 %	89.45 %
4-year Cohort Graduation Rate ³	0.00 %	84.66 %
5-year Cohort Graduation Rate	**	85.60 %
6-year Cohort Graduation Rate	**	*Not calculated at the state level

**The school did not service students in the grade levels assessed by this metric.

The table above lists the school's available DSSF On Track to Graduation ratings.

Respond to the following questions.

- Based on the school's On Track to Graduation ratings over the course of the charter term, discuss the school's current performance and provide explanations/root causes (positive and negative) for the results.

School Comments:

A fundamental component of DDLHS is that it provides a valuable high school education

to any eligible student. Many students enroll at DDLHS after having a negative 9th-grade experience at another high school. A large portion of these students have failed two or more key freshman courses at their originating high school: ELA, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, and/or Foreign Language. DDLHS provides these at-risk students with the personalized instructional environment and rigorous curriculum they need to succeed and graduate on-time. This explains our low score in the "On-Track in the 9th Grade" category (61% versus the State average of 89%).

DDLHS accepts students who are not on-track to graduate after 9th grade from other high schools. We work with each student to identify barriers to on-time graduation (e.g., failed 9th-grade mathematics). We then develop individualized course pathways for the remaining high school years that allow the student to graduate on-time. Students may be required to "double up" on a certain subject in a given year. We are exploring flexible delivery methods that help students take ownership of their educations by selecting the format/timing that works best for them. In addition to normal courses offered during the school year, some targeted courses may be offered over the summer and/or on-line.

Guidance will review each student's progress in the critical courses each marking period to immediately address problem areas and drive on-time graduation.

b) Looking ahead, what are your expected outcomes for On Track to Graduation and what steps will you take to achieve them?

School Comments:

"On-Track in the 9th grade" is an important metric. It highlights the percentage of students who are at-risk for dropping out of high school. DDLHS recognizes that our score of 61.41% is well below the State average. Since many of our students arrive after 9th grade, we do not have complete control over the data point. However, we use it as an alarm and as a rallying point for our staff. We are working with a population of students who (statistically) would not graduate from a traditional high school. Compared to other high schools in the State, DDLHS has almost 30% more at-risk students. We provide a space for these students to exhibit their strengths and develop proficiencies in a way that allows them to graduate from high school.

DDLHS expects over 90% of DDLHS 9th-graders to be on-track for graduation after their freshman year. We will do this through careful observance of marking period grades in the measured subject areas and frequent data-based conversations with 9th-grade instructional staff. Personalized interventions will be incorporated, as appropriate.

c) Describe how you will measure progress to determine whether you are on track to meet your expected On Track to Graduation outcomes.

School Comments:

Students begin their DDLHS experience at various entry points in their high school careers. Whether they enroll at DDLHS in 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade, guidance spends time with the students during the enrollment process to review transcripts and credits. This collaboration allows the students to understand what is required to graduate on-time and the scheduling options that will allow this.

To ensure that these important enrollment meetings occur, DDLHS will measure the percentage of incoming students who have a graduation course schedule by their fifth school day. Guidance will work in collaboration with students and staff to create this schedule for every semester.

DDLHS will measure the percentage of students who fail a course in ELA, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, and Foreign Language each semester. This will help us identify where additional supports are required for students and staff.

DDLHS will create and manage the list of students who are not on-track to graduate on-time. This list will exist for all grades. All staff members will be aware of the list and will provide relevant updates to administrators (e.g., a student is in danger of failing a class).

2.5 College & Career Preparation Data

Note: Please utilize the hyperlinks in this sentence for more information about the [Academic Performance Framework](#) or the [Delaware School Success Framework \(DSSF\)](#).

Academic Achievement	Delaware School Success Framework (DSSF)	
	2016-2017	
Rating	0 Stars (-1/50pts)	
	School	State
Growth to Proficiency ELA	n/a	59.19 %
Growth to Proficiency Math	n/a	35.41 %
College & Career Preparation	n/a	49.64 %

The table above lists the school's available DSSF College and Career Preparation ratings.

Respond to the following questions.

- a) Based on your College and Career Preparation ratings over the course of the school year, discuss the school's current performance and provide explanations/root causes for the results. Please include local assessment data if applicable.

School Comments:

DDLHS will graduate its first class of seniors in the Spring of 2018. Accordingly, DDLHS does not have sufficient data at this time to respond to this area of the DSSF.

- b) Looking ahead, what are your expected outcomes for College and Career Preparation and what steps will you take to achieve them?

School Comments:

DDLHS is prototyping a variety of college and career readiness (“CC&R”) programming in SY17-18 in preparation for SY18-19. Examples of DDLHS’s initiatives include, without limitation, dual enrollment, internships, self-guided online study, IDEO’s Purpose Project, and development of multiple new Career and Technical Education Pathways.

- c) Describe how you will measure progress to determine whether you are on track to meet your expected College and Career Preparation outcomes.

School Comments:

DDLHS will use multiple measures to track college and career readiness. Data points will include grades, attendance, behavior, academic assessments, teacher recommendations, and C&CR course enrollment numbers and successful completions.

III. ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

The Organizational Performance Framework reflects expectations the charter school is required to meet through state and federal law and the charter performance agreement, and seeks to provide information regarding these key questions:

- ☐ Is the school organizationally sound and well operated?
- ☐ Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations and sound public stewardship?
- ☐ Is the school meeting its obligations and expectations for appropriate access, education, support services, and outcomes for students with disabilities?

3.1 Mission Specific Goal(s)

Is the school faithful to its mission as defined in its current charter, including approved mission-specific academic goals if applicable?

Essential Question indicator 1a. Is the school faithful to its mission as defined in its current charter, including approved mission-specific academic goals if applicable				
Staff				
Measure	Definition of Rating	Data Source	Data Collection Process	Measure
	<p>Meets Standard:</p> <p>In the 2015-2016 opening school year, school leadership, faculty, and DDLHS co-founders Dr. Cristina Alvarez and Dr. Martin Rayala, worked collaboratively to establish the mission specific components of the academic program. Design-Lab Schools LLC provided educational support services and targeted resources to support DDLHS to implement the design thinking-based innovations approved in the charter in the areas of teacher and staff development and curriculum and pedagogy.</p> <p>Specific design thinking professional development was provided to all faculty members throughout the school year. Subject coaches supported the professional development of mathematics, science, English language arts and technology education teachers. Teachers and students practiced how to use the design thinking processes in all classes, and in several clubs, to deepen their learning.</p>	<p>Budget</p> <p>Professional Development Calendar</p> <p>Agenda</p> <p>Lesson Plans</p> <p>Unit Plans</p> <p>Google Docs</p> <p>DPASS II Teacher Evaluations</p>	<p>PDF Upload and entry into system by DOE.</p>	1a.1
	<p>The design thinking process used by teachers and students in all subjects begins with identifying the problem (practicing empathy for another); researching (to learn more about it); developing criteria (What does a good solution need?); generating ideas (What are some possibilities?); selecting the best possibilities (What fits the criteria best?); producing the design (rapid prototype, model, layout) implementing (See if it works.); evaluating the solution (How is it used?) and then iterating to refine the solution.</p> <p>100% of DDLHS students in grades 9 and 10 were enrolled in the mission specific courses of Technology Education or Media Design, in which they demonstrated visual note taking and visual communication skills by sketching, creating posters, animations, videos, websites, graphic designs, exhibits, and projects. Students demonstrated growth in visual literacy (the ability to interpret, negotiate and make meaning from information presented in visual form) as measured by work products produced in class work, portfolios, and projects.</p> <p>100% of DDLHS students in grades 9 and 10 completed 60-hours of participation in collaborative or service learning which was tracked by the guidance counselor and incorporated into each Student Success Plan. Since a core purpose of design is to make the world a better place for everyone, students used design thinking to demonstrate increased civic responsibility.</p>	<p>Student Schedules</p> <p>Transcripts</p> <p>Student Work</p> <p>Portfolios</p> <p>Projects</p>		
		<p>Guidance Files</p> <p>Career Cruising</p> <p>Student Success Plans</p>		

- a) Rate the school's performance according to the criteria established by the school for its 2016-2017 mission specific goal(s).

School Comments:

The table above reflects the school's mission specific goals for the SY15-16, rather than the current report year. In this report, DDLHS will respond to the mission specific goal data provided to the Department of Education for SY16-17.

In the 2016-2017, our second year of operation, school leadership and faculty continued to work collaboratively to establish the mission specific components of the academic program. Design-Lab Schools, LLC provided educational support services and targeted resources to support DDLHS in its efforts to implement the design thinking- based innovations approved in the charter in the areas of teacher and staff development and curriculum and pedagogy.

In support of this statement, DDLHS presents in Appendix 1:
2017 Mission Driven Budget showing expenditures for Design Thinking Services
Design Thinking Unit Plan Template
Sample Design Thinking Unit Plan

Subject matter coaches provided by DASL and ARTC supported the professional development of mathematics, science, English language arts and technology education teachers, as well. Teachers and students practiced how to use the design thinking processes in all classes, and in several clubs, to deepen their learning.

In support of this statement, DDLHS presents in Appendix 1:
Student Work evidencing Design Thinking Processes

The design thinking process used by teachers and students in all subjects begins with identifying the problem (practicing empathy for another); researching (to learn more about it); developing criteria (What does a good solution need?); generating ideas (What are some possibilities?); selecting the best possibilities (What fits the criteria best?); producing the design (rapid prototype, model, layout) implementing (See if it works.); evaluating the solution (How is it used?) and then iterating to refine the solution. The design thinking process was posted in classrooms throughout the building and utilized by students daily.

In support of this statement, DDLHS present in Appendix 1:
Photograph of the Design Thinking Process as posted in classroom

100% of DDLHS students in grades 9, 10 and 11 were enrolled in the mission specific courses of Technology Education, Media Design and/or Design, in which they demonstrated visual note taking and visual communication skills by sketching, creating posters, animations, videos, websites, graphic designs, exhibits, and projects. Students

demonstrated growth in visual literacy (the ability to interpret, negotiate and make meaning from information presented in visual form) as measured by work products produced in class work, portfolios, and projects.

*In support of this statement, DDLHS presents in Appendix 1:
Student schedules and transcripts – available in eSchool
Samples of student work – photographic and written*

DDLHS students in grades 9, 10 and 11 are required to participate in collaborative or service learning tracked by the guidance counselor. Because a core purpose of design is to make the world a better place for everyone, students used design thinking to demonstrate increased civic responsibility and empathy.

*In support of this statement, DDLHS presents in Appendix 1:
Samples of student community service/volunteer hour commitments*

b) Provide as **Appendix 1** the results (data source) of the school's mission specific goal(s). Remember not to include any personally identifiable information (PII).

3.2 Organizational Performance

Note: Please utilize the hyperlink in this sentence for more information about the [Organizational Performance Framework](#).

The following tables will be completed by the Charter School Office. Please review for accuracy.

SUMMARY AND OVERALL RATING

Delaware Design Lab

Year	Education Program				Governance & Reporting			Students & Staff		Transportation, Health & Safety	OVERALL RATING
	Mission Fidelity	Applicable State & Federal Requirements	Students with Disabilities	English learners	Governance & Public Stewardship	Oversight of School Management	Reporting Requirements	Students Rights	Req. on Teacher Certification & Hiring		
	1a	1b	1c	1d	2a	2b	2c	3a	3b	4a	
2016-2017	M	M	M	M	AS	M	M	M	M	M	Meets Standard

a) Describe the school’s organizational performance over the current school year (This section is for the school to address any overall rating where the school has not met standards. The school will be able to address individual metrics in the sections below.)

School Comments:

DDLHS has met standards in all but one area, where it is approaching standard. The school is approaching standard due to a single factor – Board and CBOC members who have not completed the financial training provided by the Department of Education (“DOE”). As set forth below, all Board and CBOC members have or will be trained in

before the end of the calendar year, resulting in an increased rating in this metric.

b) Identify changes to organizational practices that the school has implemented to improve the school's organizational outcomes.

School Comments:

The school has met standards in the area of Organizational Framework for each year that it has been assessed. The School's primary organizational improvements this year relate to Measures 1c (Students with Disabilities), 2a (Governance and Public Stewardship) and 2b (Oversight of School Management). Regarding measure 1c (Students with Disabilities), DDLHS performed poorly on a Department of Education ("DOE") audit conducted in the fall of 2016. With the support of the DOE, DDLHS has reorganized its special education department and successfully completed Prong 1 of the DOE's review process. DDLHS expects to successfully complete Prong 2 of the DOE review before the end of the calendar year. As part of DDLHS's 2017 minor modification, DDLHS worked diligently to clarify its internal management structure and organize its Board of Directors to ensure that both systems operated with maximum efficiency and effectiveness. Regarding the Board of Directors, DDLHS reorganized its committee structure, developed an annual calendar of items to be conducted during regular Board meetings, and scheduled the appropriate trainings for all Board members. To improve oversight of school management, DDLHS instituted a Board Oversight Accountability Committee that inspects management's compliance with Board policies on a quarterly basis.

c) Address any measure where school did not meet standard or is approaching standard.

DDLHS is approaching standard in Measure 2a (Governance and Public Stewardship) due to the fact that certain members of the CBOC and Board of Directors had not completed financial training as of June 30, 2017. As reported to CSAC in the Spring of 2017, all members of the DDLHS Board are scheduled to complete the training referenced herein. However, the DOE did not offer the necessary training sessions until after the June 30, 2017 deadline. As of the date of this report, all but 2 members of the DDLHS Board have completed the required training. Now that the training is available on a self-paced schedule, all members are on track to complete such training prior to the end of December, 2017.

DDLHS Board Members also underwent Performance Framework Training (DOE Provided) in February 2017.

2. GOVERNANCE AND REPORTING

Measure 2a.

Is the school fulfilling essential governance and public stewardship responsibilities?

DOE Rating Information:

There is one or more members of the school's Board and/or CBOC that did not obtain Fiscal Training within the allotted timeframe

School Response To Rating:

As reported to CSAC in the Spring of 2017, all members of the DDLHS CBOC and Board of Directors are scheduled to complete the training referenced herein. However, the DOE did not offer the necessary training sessions until after the June 30, 2017 deadline. As of the date of this report, all but 2 members of the DDLHS Board have completed the required training. Now that the training is available on a self-paced schedule, all members are on track to complete such training prior to the end of December, 2017.

DDLHS Board Members also underwent Performance Framework Training (DOE Provided) in February 2017.

Performance Agreement

Organizational Performance Expectations

Discuss the school's organizational performance based on its approved Performance Agreement.

By 2017, our expectation is to achieve the overall rating of "Meets", as measured by the Organizational Performance Framework." Each year, we will be on track to demonstrate performance aligned with this organizational performance expectation. This progress will be monitored through our annual performance review.

- a) Discuss the school's organizational performance based on its approved Performance Agreement (see above).

School Comments:

The school has complied with its performance agreement.

3.3 Board Financial and Governance Members and Training

a) Please complete the chart below with the necessary information. In accordance with Del. 14 §512 (15), the school shall have a satisfactory plan to ensure the effectiveness of its board of trustees, including governance trainings conducted for any new board members and at a minimum of once every 3 years.

Board Financial and Governance Training

First Name	Last Name	Term Begin Date	Term End Date	Role/Title	Financial Training Date	Board Governance Training Date*
Rebecca	Collins			Vice Chair	10/24/2017	
Mary	Diamond			At large		
Don	France			Treasurer		
Joe	LoPorto			Parent Representative	10/24/2017	
Paul	Miller			President	7/25/2017	
Aileen	Murray				7/25/2017	
Matt	Urban					
Melissa	Siwiec				10/29/2017	

*Please list only the most recent training date.

Please attach all certificates or evidence of Board Governance Training for active board members.

School Comments:

As of June 30, 2017, neither Don France nor Melissa Siwiec were members of the Board of Directors. Rebecca Girten, however, was a member of the Board of Directors. DDLHS presents the following chart showing the appropriate Board members, positions, and trainings as of June 30, 2017.

First Name	Last Name	Term Begin Date	Term End Date	Role/Title	Financial Training Date	Board Governance Training Date
Rebecca	Collins	5/1/2016	Resigned	Vice Chair	10/24/2017	Fall 2017*
Mary	Diamond	12/8/2015	12/8/2018	At large	TBD	Fall 2017*
Rebecca	Girten	1/1/2016	Resigned	At large	7/25/2017	Fall 2015
Joe	LoPorto	5/1/2016	5/1/2019	Parent Representative	10/24/2017	Fall 2017*
Paul	Miller	1/1/2015	1/1/2018	President	7/25/2017	Fall 2015
Aileen	Murray	1/1/2017	1/1/2020	Teacher Representative	7/25/2017	Fall 2017*
Matt	Urban	1/1/2015	1/1/2018	Immediate Past President	TBD	Fall 2015

*Informal training is provided throughout the year at various Board meetings by the Department of Education and/ or the Delaware Charter School Network. Additional information training was provided at the annual Board retreat held on August 27, 2017 from 8:30 am to 1:00 pm. The agenda for the Board retreat is attached.

b) Please complete the chart below with the necessary information. Pursuant to [14 Del. Admin. Code 736](#) 6.1 Each member of a Citizen Budget Oversight Committee shall attend and receive a Certificate of Completion for the Citizen Budget Oversight Committee training within three ((3) months of subsequent appointment to a Citizen Budget Oversight Committee. Provided further, additional training may be required from time to time as determined by the Department.

Citizen Budget Oversight Committee Membership & Trainings

First Name	Last Name	Term Begin Date	Term End Date	Role/Title	Financial Training Date
Cory	Budischak			Secretary	
Brian	Shulman				

School Comments:

[To be completed after financial training information provided]

3.4 Teacher Retention: Is the school monitoring and minimizing teacher attrition rates and maintaining a stable teaching staff?

2016-2017		
% of Teachers RETAINED	# of Teachers RETAINED	# of Teachers ELIGIBLE
50	10	20

Review the table above with the school's teacher retention trends and answer the following questions.

- a) Describe the school's plans to monitor and minimize teacher attrition rates. Provide information about why teachers leave the school.

School Comments:

Of the teachers who were not retained in 2016, two left for personal reasons unrelated to the school.

- *One teacher left due a death in the family and chose not to return to teaching.*
- *One teacher retired at year-end.*

Additionally, three teachers were unfortunately furloughed mid-year due to budgetary constraints. For the remaining teachers, DDLHS conducted exit interviews with each to determine the underlying causes for teacher attrition. Three teachers stated increased pay as the primary reason for leaving DDLHS, and two teachers took jobs at district high schools in the area. DDLHS has reason to believe that the third teacher moved out of the area and is employed at a district school in Pennsylvania. One teacher stated a desire to teach a different course than the one he currently was teaching, and is now employed teaching his preferred subject matter at a local district middle school. Finally, one teacher cited climate and culture as the primary cause of her departure, but has since returned to DDLHS in a non-teaching capacity to assist with data collection and analysis activities.

Given this data, DDLHS has budgeted appropriately for FY17-18 to ensure job security for all teachers and staff. DDLHS also intends to continue to promote teacher satisfaction through development of a professional environment where teachers feel fulfilled in their professions and are given the opportunity to achieve personal and professional goals.

b) Describe how the school's professional development plans support teachers and leadership.

School Comments:

DDLHS has a very strong professional development program led primarily by the DASL and PDCE teams at the University of Delaware. DASL provides ongoing leadership coaching for DDLHS's school administrators, as well as DPAS-II evaluation support and ongoing coaching for teachers who do not meet standards on their DPAS-II evaluations. PDCE provides substantial training in design thinking and project based learning, as well as content coaching for ARTC teachers. All initial license teachers have an internal school mentor and participate in the State of Delaware's Comprehensive Induction Program. DDLHS also provides internal professional development regularly in the area of climate and culture, student support, and instructional/classroom best practices.

IV. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

4.1 Financial Performance

Note: Please utilize the hyperlink in this sentence for more information about the [Financial Performance Framework](#).

The following tables will be completed by the Charter School Office. Please review for accuracy.

Financial Performance Framework Ratings	Near Term Indicators				Sustainability Indicators				Financial Management and Oversight	Overall Rating
	Current Ratio	Days Cash	Enrollment Variance	Default, Loan Covenants, & Debt Service Payments	Total Margin	Debt Asset Ratio	Cash Flow	Debt Service Coverage Ratio		
Year	1a	1b	1c	1d	2a	2b	2c	2d	3	
2016-2017	F	AS	F	M	N/R	F	N/R	N/R	M	Falls Far Below Standard

a) Describe the school's Financial performance over the current school year (This section is for the school to address any overall rating where the school has not met standards. The school will be able to address individual metrics in the sections below.)

School Comments:

For indicators 1a and 2b, DDLHS's framework is affected by the existence of a legally disputed liability that must be reported for accounting purposes, but which DDLHS does not believe is owed. Absent that liability, DDLHS would meet standard in both of these areas. DDLHS recognizes its enrollment variance is unfavorable, but asserts that this measure is not indicative of actual financial performance because DDLHS ended its year in a positive cash flow position. DDLHS approaches or meets standard in all other areas.

- b) Identify changes to Financial practices that the school has implemented to improve the school's financial outcomes.
-

School Comments:

In FY16-17, DDLHS made budgeting errors that led to the furlough of three teachers mid-year, as well as year-end cash flow concerns. In order to rectify these problems, DDLHS was careful to create a highly conservative budget for FY17-18 in order to ensure proper staffing levels and adequate cash flow. DDLHS also put into place multiple fiscal policies – both at the Board level and the School level - designed to ensure adequate controls over expenditures, including multi-level review and approvals for all expenditures. DDLHS's enrollment variance is affected, in part, by student attrition related to instability of the school's leadership. DDLHS believes that it has stabilized its administrative team, which will lead to increased student retention and, therefore, increased enrollment following its 3rd year of operation. Finally, DDLHS has substantially decreased its operations in FY17-18 by replacing its provider of design thinking professional development with an exceptionally qualified, yet much more cost effective, alternative.

c) Address any measure where school did not meet standard or is approaching standard

Measure 1a. Current Ratio:

Current Assets divided by Current Liabilities

2016-2017
0.34

The current ratio measures a school's ability to pay its obligations over the next twelve months. The preferred result is more than 1.0, which indicates that the school's current assets exceed its current liabilities.

School Response To Rating:

The school's ratio is based upon numbers that include a disputed liability of \$768,081. The school disputes the liability for legal reasons and anticipates that this liability will be removed from its books before the end of the next fiscal year. Absent the disputed liability, the schools Measure 1a ratio is 1.00, which "meets standard."

Measure 1b. Days Cash:

Cash divided by (Total Expenses / 365)

2016-2017
17

The days cash on hand ratio indicates how many days a school can pay its expenses without another inflow of cash. The preferred result is more than 60 days cash.

School Response To Rating:

DDLHS recognized its cash position was dwindling at the end of calendar year 2016. To prevent further deterioration in this area, DDLHS implemented substantial financial controls in the first quarter of 2017 aimed at retaining cash on hand. With new controls in place, DDLHS anticipates that available cash at the end of this fiscal year will meet or exceed standard.

Measure 1c. Enrollment Variance:

Actual Enrollment as of September 30 divided by Authorized Enrollment



The enrollment variance depicts actual versus authorized enrollment. A school budgets based on projected enrollment but is funded based on actual enrollment; therefore, a school that fails to meet its enrollment targets may not be able to meet its budgeted expenses. The preferred result is more than 95%.

School Response To Rating:

DDLHS finished the 2016-2017 school year in a positive cash flow position. While the enrollment variance data shows that DDLHS did not meet the preferred result, the variance did not materially affect the operations of the school. For the upcoming fiscal year, DDLHS planned for a substantial enrollment variance to ensure adequate funds to support budgeted expenses.

Measure 2b. Debt to Asset Ratio:

Total Liabilities divided by Total Assets

2016-2017

1.12

The debt to asset ratio compares the school's liabilities to its assets, or what a school owes against what it owns. The preferred result is less than 0.90.

School Response To Rating:

The school's ratio is based upon numbers that include a disputed liability of \$768,081. The school disputes the liability for legal reasons and anticipates that this liability will be removed from its books before the end of the next fiscal year. Absent the disputed liability, the schools Measure 2b ratio is .39, which "meets standard."

3. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT

2016-2017

M

This measure assesses the timeliness of reporting, the implementation of the Citizen Budget Oversight Committee, and the adherence to the policies and procedures of the First State Financial Management System.

DOE Rating Information:

The FY17 independent audit disclosed related party transactions in the notes to the financial statements (Note F).

School Response To Rating:

DDLHS “meets standard” in this area. DDLHS complies with best practices when entering into related party transactions and complies with all legal disclosure requirements associated therewith.

Performance Agreement

Financial Performance Expectations

By 2017, our expectation is to achieve the overall rating of "Meets" standard as measured by the Financial Performance Framework. Each year, we will be on track to demonstrate economic viability and achieve our financial performance expectation. This progress will be monitored through our annual performance review.

- a) Discuss the school's financial performance based on its approved Performance Agreement.

School Comments:

DDLHS did not meet its commitment under the Performance Agreement as it relates to the Financial Performance Framework for SY16-17. This failure derives primarily from the existence of a legally disputed liability that must be reported for accounting purposes, but which DDLHS does not believe is owed. Absent that liability, DDLHS would meet standard in all areas of the Financial Performance Framework, save one, and would achieve the overall rating of "Meets" standard as required by the Performance Agreement. DDLHS significantly reduced expenses, while simultaneously developing a more conservative budget, for FY17-18, resulting in an ability to absorb unexpected expenses and unfavorable enrollment variances without compromising its financial viability.

-
- b) Describe how the school developed and implemented a corrective action plan in response to audit findings (if applicable).

School Comments:

DDLHS's 2017 Audit was "unqualified" and did not require a corrective action plan.

V. INNOVATION

Describe the school's innovative practice(s) that could be replicated at other schools in Delaware. Please include the data that supports the success of these practice(s).

School Comments:

VII. ANNUAL REPORT CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

Name of School:	
Location:	

I hereby certify that the information submitted in this annual of a charter school is true to the best of my knowledge and belief; that this application has been approved by the school's Board of Directors.

Signature: Chairperson of Board of Directors (or designated signatory authority)
Date

Print/Type Name:	
Title (if designated):	
Date of approval by board of directors:	

References:

¹ Based on September 30th Unit Count

² Pursuant to the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (34 CFR §99), the DDOE applies the following statistical methods to avoid disclosure of personally identifiable information in aggregate reporting.

1. For all data, counts for groups or subgroups with 15 or fewer students are suppressed and represented by “-” in data reports. Complementary suppression of one or more non-sensitive cells in a table may be required so that the values of the suppressed cells may not be calculated by subtracting the reported values from the row and column totals.
2. Only report percentages for grade level reporting within a school and district.
3. Percentages are suppressed when the underlying student counts can be derived for groups or subgroups with 15 or fewer students (i.e., if the number tested and proficient are reported, then the percentage may need to be suppressed).
4. Any percentage above 95 or below 5 will be reported as >95% and <5%, respectively.

³ Graduation rate data is lag data by one school year to include all students that have completed their high school diplomas during that year including summer graduates.