



Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
2014-2015

**THE EQUITY PROJECT CHARTER SCHOOL
ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW REPORT**

2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR

Part 1: School Overview

Charter Authorization Profile

The Equity Project Charter School	
Authorized Grades	Grades 5-8
Authorized Enrollment	480
School Opened For Instruction	2009-2010
Charter Term Expiration Date	June 30, 2018
Last Renewal Term Type	Full Term (5 years)

School Information for the 2014-2015 School Year

The Equity Project Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	David Coleman
School Leader(s)	Zeke Vanderhoek
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 6
Borough(s) of Location	Manhattan
Physical Address(es)	549 Audubon Avenue, New York, NY 10040
Facility Owner(s)	DOE
School Type	Middle School
Grades Served 2014-2015	Grades 5-8
Enrollment in 2014-2015*	480
Charter Universal Pre-Kindergarten Program	No

* Enrollment data as of October 1, 2014.

Enrollment Policies (School Year 2014-2015)*	
Primary Grade Level(s) for Which Student Applications for Admission are Accepted	Grade 5
Additional Grade Level(s) for Which Student Applications for Admission are Accepted	Grades 6-8
Does School Enroll New Students Mid-Year	Yes
Number of Applicants for Admission	357
Number of Students Accepted via the Charter Lottery	122
Lottery Preferences (School Year 2014-2015)**	
Attends a Failing School	No
Does Not Speak English at Home	Yes
Receives SNAP or TANF Benefits	No
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch	No
Has IEP and/or Receives Special Education Services	Yes
Homeless or Living in Shelter or Temporary Residence	No
Lives in New York City Housing Authority Housing	No
Unaccompanied Youth	No

* Enrollment policy information is based on self-reported data from the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey.

** Preferences were recorded from the NYC Charter School Center's Online Application. For schools that do not participate in the Common Application, their preferences were self-reported from the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey. If a field is marked "N/A", the school did not provide the information.

Management or Support Organization (If Applicable)	
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A

For the self-reported mission of this charter school, please see their NYC Charter School Directory listing at <http://schools.nyc.gov/community/planning/charters/Directory.htm>.

School Reported Current Key Design Elements	
Key Design Element	Description
Using Master Teachers to Serve At-Risk Students	To attract master teachers, The Equity Project Charter School (TEP) uses a three-pronged strategy: rigorous qualifications, redefined expectations, and revolutionary compensation. All master teachers earn a \$125,000 annual salary.
Equal Emphasis on Academics, Arts & Athletics	To provide a comprehensive and motivating educational experience, TEP students take a full academic program as well as daily instruction in music and physical education (unusual for a middle school). TEP has competitive music and arts clubs and over a dozen athletic teams.
Use of Interim Assessments & Student Achievement Reports to Drive Instruction	Student Achievement Reports (SARs) are used by all teachers to measure individual student progress towards the three to four most important learning outcomes for each subject and grade level. Assessment data is updated regularly and analyzed three times per year to drive instruction.
Shared Accountability for Literacy Development	TEP students take four periods each day focused on Common Core literacy standards: one period of ELA, one period of small group writing, one period of social studies, and one period of science. The integration of literacy skills across content areas promotes shared accountability in this area.
Dedicated Social Worker for Each Cohort	Each cohort has one dedicated bilingual Social Worker (who moves up with that cohort from fifth to eighth grade); this structure enables the Social Worker to build long-lasting relationships with students and their families and to focus on students' social/emotional development.
Peer-based Professional Development & Three Staff Development Institutes	Each teacher spends at least two periods per week observing a partner teacher's classroom; this is followed by weekly debriefs of those observations. All TEP staff attend three one-to-two week development institutes focused on data analysis and collaborative curricular planning.

Grade-Level Enrollment (School Year 2014 - 2015)		
Grade Level	Number of Students	Section Count
Grade 5	122	4
Grade 6	122	4
Grade 7	121	4
Grade 8	115	4
Total Enrollment	480	16

* Enrollment data as of October 1, 2014.

Part 2: Annual Review Process Overview

Rating Framework

The New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) performs a comprehensive review of each NYC DOE Chancellor-authorized charter school to investigate three primary questions: is the school an academic success; is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization; and is the school in compliance with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations? To ascertain matters of sustainability and strategic planning, OSDCP also inquires about the school's plans for its next charter term.

This review is conducted by analyzing student performance data and collecting and evaluating school-submitted documents during school year 2014-2015. The report outlines evidence found during this review.

As per the school's monitoring plan, the NYC DOE may also conduct a visit to a school. Visits may focus on academic outcomes, governance, organizational structure, operational compliance, fiscal sustainability or any combination of these as necessary.

Essential Questions

Is the school an academic success?

To assess whether a school is an academic success, the NYC DOE considers performance measures, including, but not limited to, the following (as appropriate for grades served):

- New York State ELA and math assessment absolute results; New York State Regents exams passage rates;
- Comparative proficiency for elementary and middle schools, including growth rates for ELA and math proficiency;
- Comparative graduation rates and Regents completion rates for high schools;
- Closing the achievement gap performance relative to CSD or New York City public schools;
- New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) or other approved alternate assessments; and
- Performance data pertaining to college and career readiness.

Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization, OSDCP focuses on three areas: Governance Structure & Organizational Design, School Climate & Community Engagement, and Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the National Association of Charter School Authorizers' Core Performance Framework.¹

OSDCP considers a variety of supporting materials and data, including but not limited to the following:

- Board of Trustee bylaws;
- Board of Trustee meeting minutes;
- Annual Reports submitted by schools to New York State Education Department (NYSED);
- NYC DOE School Surveys;
- Data collection sheets provided by schools;
- Student, staff, and Board turnover rates;
- Audits of authorized enrollment numbers; and
- Annual financial audits.

Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?

As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with relevant laws and regulations as identified in the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework.

¹ Please refer to the following website for more information:
http://nacsa.mycrowdwisdom.com/diweb/catalog/item/id/126547/q/%20q=performance*20framework&c=82

Part 3: Summary of Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the school an academic success?

Overview of School-Specific Data Since 2012-2013

ES/MS students scoring at or above Level 3 on NYS assessments, compared to CSD, NYC and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
The Equity Project Charter School	14.2%	12.3%
CSD 6	13.5%	15.6%
Difference from CSD 6 *	0.7	-3.3
NYC	25.7%	27.4%
Difference from NYC *	-11.5	-15.1
New York State **	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-16.9	-18.3
% Proficient in Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
The Equity Project Charter School	23.3%	31.3%
CSD 6	15.0%	20.4%
Difference from CSD 6 *	8.3	10.9
NYC	27.3%	31.5%
Difference from NYC *	-4.0	-0.2
New York State **	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-7.8	-4.9

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself served.

** New York State proficiency rates were taken from data.nysed.gov.

Student improvement on the state tests compared to other students

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - English Language Arts		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
The Equity Project Charter School - All Students	69.0%	58.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	63.3%	34.6%
City Percent of Range- All Students	64.9%	30.7%
The Equity Project Charter School - School's Lowest Third	82.0%	69.0%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	55.8%	18.2%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	59.0%	22.5%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
The Equity Project Charter School - All Students	78.0%	75.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	81.8%	76.7%
City Percent of Range- All Students	91.3%	84.9%
The Equity Project Charter School - School's Lowest Third	87.0%	82.5%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	82.1%	70.9%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	88.5%	78.8%

A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A peer/city percent of range of 50% represents the position of the average and can be interpreted as a school outperforming 50% of their peer group/city.

Closing the Achievement Gap

Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - English Language Arts		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	70.7%	56.0%
English Language Learner Students	45.3%	28.9%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	56.2%	38.0%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	75.0%	69.0%
English Language Learner Students	55.6%	47.5%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	64.3%	57.6%

* Defined as students with a placement in Self-Contained, ICT, or SETSS.

Progress Towards Attainment of Academic Goals in 2013-2014²

Academic Goals	
Charter Goals	2013-2014
1. Each year, at least 75% of each cohort of eighth grade students will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA Exam. (A cohort is defined as a group of eighth grade students who have been continuously enrolled at the school for four years, beginning in fifth grade.)	Not Met
2. Each year, at least 75% of each cohort of eighth grade students will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Math Exam. (A cohort is defined as a group of eighth grade students who have been continuously enrolled at the school for four years, beginning in fifth grade.)	Not Met
3. Each year, at least 75% of each cohort of eighth grade students will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Science Exam. (A cohort is defined as a group of eighth grade students who have been continuously enrolled at the school for four years, beginning in fifth grade.)	Not Met
4. Each year, the school's median or mean adjusted growth percentile on the NYS ELA Exam as reported on the school's annual NYC DOE Progress Report will place the school in the top quartile of all peer schools (as defined by the NYC DOE School Progress Report).	N/A
5. Each year, the school's median or mean adjusted growth percentile for the school's lowest third of students on the NYS ELA Exam as reported on the school's annual NYC DOE Progress Report will place the school in the top quartile of all peer schools (as defined by the NYC DOE School Progress Report).	N/A
6. Each year, the school's median or mean adjusted growth percentile on the NYS Math Exam as reported on the school's annual NYC DOE Progress Report will place the school in the top quartile of all peer schools (as defined by the NYC DOE School Progress Report).	N/A
7. Each year, the school's median or mean adjusted growth percentile for the school's lowest third of students on the NYS Math Exam as reported on the school's annual NYC DOE Progress Report will place the school in the top quartile of all peer schools (as defined by the NYC DOE School Progress Report).	N/A
8. Each year, the school will have an average daily student attendance rate of at least 95%.	Met

² Goals were self-reported by the school in the school's 2013-2014 Annual Report documentation submitted to NYSED. It should be noted that beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, due to a change in state regulation, the NYC DOE will not evaluate goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two. Further, due to the elimination of the accountability instrument, the DOE will not evaluate goals related to NYC DOE Progress Report grades beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.

Self-Reported Responsive Education Program & Learning Environment³

Curriculum Changes and/or Adjustments

- Given The Equity Project Charter School's focus on fifth and sixth grade literacy, the school implemented a number of changes to support accelerated growth in this area for students.

Interim Assessments

- The school administers interim cycle assessments designed to assess progress towards mastery of the Common Core Learning Standards.

Approach to Data-Driven Instruction

- Student Achievement Reports (SARs) are used by all teachers to measure individual student progress towards the three to four most important learning outcomes for each subject and grade level.
- A subject-specific SAR identifies the specific assessments that are used to measure each outcome (including, but not limited to, state assessments), and establishes a definition of success for each outcome based on growth or mastery targets.
- The ELA, Science, and Social Studies SARs are aligned to the Common Core literacy standards and to one another.
- SARs assessment data is updated and analyzed regularly, including comprehensive analyses three times per year (at the conclusion of each trimester) to drive instructional modifications for the subsequent trimester.

Philosophy on Special Education and English Language Learner Service Provision

- The school uses an "inclusion" model in which special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students receive instruction together with general education students in classrooms that support a variety of ability levels and learning styles.
- The school's highest need special education and ELL students are served in a Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) class; all classes utilize Structured English Immersion (SEI).
- The CTT class benefits from the presence of two teachers – the General Education teacher and the Special Education teacher-- in a variety of subjects, typically ELA and Math. There are one or two CTT classes per grade.
- The school also provides Special Education teacher support services (SETSS) classes (small group ELA or math classes) as well as related services.
- A number of high-need ELL and special education students also benefit from after-school tutoring and Reading Buddy programs, in which they receive one-to-one academic support.
- There is at least one Special Education teacher for each grade level and a number of teachers on staff with specific expertise in ELL instruction.
- The school also has a Special Education Coordinator.

Teacher Evaluation

- Each teacher is evaluated in five primary domains:
 - *Professional Expectations*: This domain includes the teacher's attendance and punctuality as well as his/her ability to meet deadlines.
 - *Adherence to Staff Norms*: Each teacher is evaluated in this domain via an anonymous electronic survey completed by his/her colleagues on the extent to which that teacher adheres to the school's 10 Staff Norms. These norms were developed by the school's faculty to establish specific expectations around how staff will interact to create a collaborative, positive, productive, and respectful school culture.
 - *Classroom Management*: This domain is assessed by Principal and/or Assistant Principal observations, as well as by student perception data taken from electronic surveys that students complete about each teacher. On these surveys, students rate their agreement with classroom management related statements for each teacher such as "Students in this

³ Self-reported information from school-submitted ACR self-evaluation form on April 27, 2015.

class treat the teacher with respect.” The selected statements have been correlated via research to student achievement gains.

- *Instructional Planning and Delivery*: This domain is assessed by both Principal and/or Assistant Principal observations, as well as by student surveys on which students rate their agreement with instruction-related statements for each teacher.
- *Assessment of Student Growth*: This domain is assessed by analyzing the extent to which students have achieved success targets in the subject-area outcomes established by each teacher through the SARs process described above.

Differentiated Instruction

- Instructional differentiation takes a number of forms. Practices include:
 - Lessons that emphasize a variety of learning styles. Lessons incorporate audio, visual, experiential, and written components in order to provide multiple access points into a concept and a variety of ways to understand it.
 - Assessments that provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate understanding at various levels. Instead of binary right/wrong questions, assessment tasks are structured to pinpoint the level of understanding that the student has achieved, thereby providing teachers with a map of the concepts and skills where additional work is needed.
 - Varied instructional groupings including both heterogeneous groupings (e.g. partner work in which partners learn from one another's different skills and abilities) and homogenous groupings (e.g. math support small group classes in which students receive either remediation or enrichment practice to supplement the instruction that takes place in regular math classes).

Adjustments Based on 2013-2014 Data

- Data from the 2013-14 school year indicated that literacy in the early grades (fifth and sixth grades specifically) is the primary academic growth area for the school. As a result, the school's primary adjustments during the 2014-2015 school year focused on providing significantly more literacy support.
- Based on data the school collected or received for the 2013-2014 school year, the school did the following during the 2014-2015 school year:
 - Created smaller groupings for ELA classes across the school, with particular focus on fifth grade;
 - Provided curricular support for fifth grade ELA teachers through more frequent feedback and the use of a blended learning consultant;
 - Introduced an after-school Reading Buddies program for the fifth and sixth grades (approximately 50 students in the school's incoming class were enrolled in the program, in which they read one-on-one with an adult or older peer for two hours each week); and
 - Provided structured planning opportunities throughout the year for ELA, Science, and Social Studies teachers on each grade level to align literacy-based instruction and focus on intervention plans for specific students.

Learning Environment

- Data from the 2013-2014 NYC DOE School Survey indicates that the school's school learning environment is exceeding city targets in all areas, including instructional core, school culture, and systems for improvement.
- The school also utilizes attendance data as an indicator of the success of the learning environment. In the 2013-2014 school year, the school had a 96.7% attendance rate (according to the 2013-2014 DOE School Quality Guide).
- The school utilizes three guiding principles to maintain a positive learning environment:
 - The school aims to create a positive culture that emphasizes success and motivates students to succeed.
 - Strong classroom management is based on strong relationships between and among teachers and students. As such, disciplinary consequences should be relational; this means that consequences should promote relationship-building and repair (e.g. between a pair of

students or between a teacher and a student). Consequences that do not have a relational component should be avoided.

- The school serves all students, no matter how challenging.
- Over the past year, the first principle—focusing on the development of a positive (as opposed to punitive) culture—has been further refined by the school's grade-level incentive leads who have developed grade-specific goals and incentives to motivate and recognize student adherence to the school's five TIGER values. These recognitions include honor rolls and awards assemblies, weekly recognitions by each grade (dress down passes, pizza parties, and incentive field trips) and the monthly Principal's Lunch. During the current school year, the Arts & Athletics department incorporated incentive policies to promote strong conduct and work habits from student athletes and student musicians.
- The school's relational approach to student discipline means that consequences such as out-of-school suspension and expulsions are not utilized (except under extreme circumstances or unless mandated by law), as these are, by definition, non-relational consequences.
 - Instead, for severe disciplinary infractions such as physical altercations or persistent bullying, the school utilizes in-school suspensions (ISS) designed to promote reflection and repair. During ISS, a student completes his/her regular classwork away from his/her peers. The student and his/her family meet with a Social Worker and with the school's Principal and/or Assistant Principal; in addition the student engages in a one-on-one counseling session with a Social Worker, completes a reflective one-on-one conversation with the school Principal and/or Assistant Principal, and meets for individual check-ins with most, if not all, of the teachers on his/her grade level team. The student also completes a written reflection and engages in any repair-work necessary to rebuild relationships.
- During the past year the school developed a new discipline module for the school's online Student Information System. This has provided staff with a much more robust tracking mechanism for discipline data; this data in turn enables more targeted interventions for individual students.

Essential Question 2: Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

School Leadership Team (School Year 2014-2015)		
Title	Name	Number of Years With the School
1. Principal	Zeke Vanderhoek	6
2. Assistant Principal	Casey Ash	6
3. Director of Finance & Operations	Shelly Gupta	6

Board of Trustees (School Year 2014-2015)		
Board Member Name	Position – <i>Committee(s)</i>	Was all Documentation Submitted to OSDCP? Was Board Member Approved by OSDCP?
1. David Coleman	President	Yes
2. Brooks Clark		Yes
3. Crystal Harmon	Secretary	Yes
4. Nicole Leach		Yes
5. Laura Tavormina	Treasurer & Vice President	Yes
6. Zeke Vanderhoek		Yes

Board of Trustees Committees (School Year 2014-2015)		
Committee Name	Is This an Active Committee?	Evidence of Committee Activity (Roster, Committee Meeting Minutes, etc.)
1. N/A ⁴		

⁴ The school did not report any committees (active or otherwise) for its Board of Trustees

School Climate & Community Engagement

The Equity Project Charter School	
Instructional Staff Turnover (School Year 2013-2014)*	23.3%
Instructional Staff Turnover (School Year 2014-2015)**	3.1%
Number of Instructional Staff Members Not Returning from the Previous Academic Year*	1
Does the School have a Parent Organization?	Yes
• If Yes, how many times did it meet?	5
• If Yes, how many parents attended these meetings?	10 – 40 (varies)
Average Daily Attendance Rate (School Year 2013-2014)***	96.7%

* Reflects 2013-2014 instructional staff who did not return to the school, either by choice or request, at the start of the 2014-2015 school year or who left the school during the 2013-2014 school year.

** Reflects 2014-2015 instructional staff left the school between July 1, 2014 and April 1, 2015.

*** Attendance was taken from ATS.

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree				
Survey Question		The Equity Project Charter School		Citywide Average
		2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students*	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.**	86%	81%	62%
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	81%	77%	60%
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	98%	95%	79%
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	97%	99%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	97%	96%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	98%	99%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	72%	74%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	83%	97%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	93%	100%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.	62%	81%	81%

* Students in grades kindergarten through five do not participate in the NYC School Survey.

** This question was phrased as "My teachers inspire me to learn" in the 2012-2013 School Survey.

NYC School Survey Response Rates			
		2012-2013	2013-2014
Students*	The Equity Project Charter School	96%	95%
	NYC	83%	83%
Parents	The Equity Project Charter School	97%	90%
	NYC	54%	53%
Teachers	The Equity Project Charter School	100%	97%
	NYC	83%	81%

* Students in grades kindergarten through five do not participate in the NYC School Survey.

Financial Health

Short-Term Financial Health				
	Indicator	Benchmark	School's Measure	Status
Cash Position	Number of days of operating expenses the school can cover without an infusion of cash	60 days (2 months)	153 days	Strong
Liabilities	School's position to meet liabilities expected over the next 12 months	Current assets sufficient to cover current liabilities (ratio should be greater than or equal to 1.00)	5.00	Strong
Projected Revenues	Actual enrollment for 2014-2015 is compared to projected enrollment for 2014-2015 to allow for accounts receivable of budgeted per pupil revenues	Actual enrollment within 15% of authorized enrollment (ratio should be greater than or equal to 0.85)	1.00	Strong
Debt Management	School debts as provided in audited financial statements, as well as payments on those debts	School is meeting all current debt obligations	Not in Default	Strong

Long-Term Financial Sustainability				
	Indicator	Benchmark	School's Measure	Status
Total Margin	Did the school operate at a surplus or deficit during the previous fiscal years?	Value should be greater than 0.00	0.12	Strong
	Did the school operate at a surplus or deficit during the past three fiscal years?	Value should be greater than 0.00	0.38	Strong
Ratios	Debt to Asset Ratio	Ratio should be less than 1.00	0.11	Strong
	Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Ratio should be greater than 1.00	0.00	N/A
Cash Flow	Most recent fiscal year's cash flow	Value should be greater than 0.00	\$904,865	Strong
	Trend of cash flow over the past three fiscal years	Value should be greater than 0.00	\$2,422,578	Strong

An independent audit performed for fiscal year 2014 (FY14) showed no material findings.

Essential Question 3: Is the school in compliance with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations?

Board Compliance

Board of Trustee Compliance*	
Total Number of Board Members as of April 1, 2015	6
Number of Board Members Required per the Bylaws	5
Number of Board Members Who Either Did Not Return Following the 2013-2014 School Year or Who Left During the 2014-2015 School Year:	0
Number of Board Members Who Joined the Board Prior to or During the 2014-2015 School Year	0
Board Meeting Minutes From Most Recent Meeting Posted on the School's Website?	Yes
Number of Board Meetings in the 2014-2015 School Year with a Quorum of Board Members Present / Number Meetings Required per Bylaws**	12/10

* All data presented above is as of April 1, 2015.

** Section 2851(2)(c) of the NYS Charter School Act states that charter schools shall have a "procedure for conducting and publicizing monthly board of trustee meetings at each charter school..."

School Compliance

Based on a document review and based on information provided elsewhere in this report, the school is in compliance with:

Compliance Area	Compliance
Teacher Certification ⁵	No
Employee Fingerprinting	Yes
Safety Plan/Emergency Drill	Yes
Immunization Record ⁵	Yes
Insurance	Yes
Lottery	Yes
Annual Report Submitted to SED	Yes
Financial Audit Posted	Yes

⁵ The Charter Schools Act prohibits more than five staff members or more than 30% of the teaching staff from not being certified in accordance with requirements applicable to other public schools.

Teachers (School Year 2014-2015)						
Number of Teachers:	Number of NYS Uncertified Teachers:	Percent NYS Uncertified Teachers:	Number of Highly Qualified Teachers:	Percent Highly Qualified Teachers:	Number of Teachers without Fingerprint Clearance:	Percent of Teachers Not Fingerprinted:
33	7	21.2%	33	100.0%	0	0.0%

Student Discipline

Based on a document review, the school's discipline policy contains written rules and procedures for:

Compliance Area	Evidence Submitted?	Language of Compliance Evident in the Documents Submitted?
Disciplining students	Yes	Yes
Removing students (i.e., suspending)	Yes	No
Procedures for expelling students	Yes	Yes
Notice and opportunities to be heard for Short Term Removals (10 days or fewer)	No	N/A
Notice and opportunities to be heard for Long Term Removals (more than 10 days)	Yes	Yes
Appropriate procedures for providing alternative education to students when students are removed (i.e., suspended)	Yes	Yes
Specifically addresses student discipline policy for students with disabilities	No	N/A
Does the school distribute the student discipline policy to all students and/or their families?	Yes	Yes
Number and percentage of students suspended in 2014-2015	In School Suspensions: 102 (21%) Out of School Suspensions: 0 (0%)	

Enrollment and Retention Targets⁶

New York State (NYS) charter schools are required to demonstrate the means by which they will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities (SWDs), English Language Learners (ELLs), and students who are eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL). As per the NYS Charter Schools Act, enrollment and retention targets have been finalized by the Board of Regents (BoR) and the board of trustees of the State University of New York (SUNY). These targets are meant to be comparable to the enrollment figures of such categories of the Community School District (CSD) in which the charter school is located.

⁶ State enrollment and retention targets were generated by a calculator developed by the State Education Department (SED). The NYC DOE used the calculator posted on the SED website as of April 1, 2015. Once a school's CSD, total enrollment and grade span are entered, the calculator generates a school-specific target. The CSD for a multi-district school is the primary CSD as determined by each school. The enrollment is determined by the total number of students enrolled as of October 1 for each school year. Any school with an unusual grade configuration (i.e. K, 6-9) should use an available grade configuration provided by SED that is most aligned as determined by the DOE, otherwise a school's actual grade span is used. For more information regarding SED's methodology behind the calculation of charter school enrollment and retention targets, please refer to the memo at <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2012Meetings/July2012/712brca11.pdf>.

Charter schools are also required to demonstrate “good faith efforts” to attract and retain a comparable or greater enrollment of SWDs, ELLs, and students eligible for FRPL.

As a consideration of renewal, charter schools are required to “to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets” for SWDs, ELLs, and students who are eligible for FRPL. The amendments further indicate “Repeated failure to comply with the requirement” as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.

- In school year 2014-2015, The Equity Project Charter School served:
 - a higher percentage of students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch compared to its SED-derived enrollment target for students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch;
 - a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to its SED-derived enrollment target for English Language Learner students; and
 - a higher percentage of students with disabilities than its SED-derived enrollment target for students with disabilities.
- From October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014, The Equity Project Charter School retained:
 - a higher percentage of students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch compared to its SED-derived retention target for students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch;
 - a higher percentage of English Language Learner students compared to its SED-derived retention target for English Language Learner students; and
 - a higher percentage of students with disabilities than its SED-derived retention target for students with disabilities.

Enrollment of Special Populations

Special Population		2013-2014	2014-2015
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	The Equity Project Charter School	97.9%	99.0%
	Effective Target	94.3%	94.3%
	Difference from Effective Target	+3.6	+4.7
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	The Equity Project Charter School	20.3%	19.6%
	Effective Target	14.3%	14.3%
	Difference from Effective Target	+6.0	+5.3
English Language Learners (ELL)	The Equity Project Charter School	34.9%	34.6%
	Effective Target	47.0%	47.0%
	Difference from Effective Target	-12.1	-12.4

Retention of Special Populations

Special Population		2013-2014	2014-2015
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	The Equity Project Charter School	89.7%	N/A
	Effective Target	88.7%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+1.0	-
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	The Equity Project Charter School	93.9%	N/A
	Effective Target	82.4%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+11.5	-
English Language Learners (ELL)	The Equity Project Charter School	91.2%	N/A
	Effective Target	86.7%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+4.5	-

Enrollment Information Used to Generate Targets		
	2013-2014	2014-2015
Grades Served	5-8	5-8
Enrollment	487	480
CSD(s)	6	6

Essential Question 4: What are the school's plans for the next charter term?

As reported by the school's leadership, the following is noted:⁷

- The school is currently authorized to serve 480 students in fifth through eighth grade. The school has submitted a proposed charter revision to expand the grade levels that the school serves, such that the school ultimately (by 2020) will serve students from Pre-kindergarten through eighth grade. This grade-level expansion would ultimately increase the school's total maximum enrollment to 1,200 students.
- The school has embarked on two initiatives to promote organizational sustainability:
 - New & Varied Career Models: To boost staff retention and sustainability, the school will incorporate new career opportunities into its staffing model; this will include a part-time teacher track, a curriculum writing team, the use of student-teachers, new evaluators, and a 'career development pathway' geared for non-teaching staff (e.g. lunch coaches, paraprofessionals, tutors).
 - The school will also be expanding its overall team as the school expands grade-levels and incorporates new roles for the new building (e.g. chef/kitchen staff).
 - New Middle School Facility: The school is in the final stages of the development of a new privately developed 62,000 square foot middle school facility, located less than half a mile from the school's current classroom trailers.
 - The architectural and engineering design is nearing completion and over 90% of the approximately \$37 million in financing has been secured. The school anticipates signing a construction contract by June 2015 and breaking ground on the new facility in the fall of 2015. Construction will last 18 to 24 months and the school anticipates moving in prior to the 2017-18 school year.

Please note that the school's identification of future plans as presented above for a grade expansion coupled with an enrollment expansion, as well as its future plans to develop a new facility, do not construe application by the school or approval by the NYC DOE of the charter revisions for the grade and enrollment expansion or any other initiatives. The information presented above is for informational purposes only; it reflects proposed, not approved, future plans of the school. A formal non-material or material charter revision request would need to be submitted as appropriate, consistent with the NYC DOE's timelines and requirements, as the charter authorizing entity.

⁷ Self-reported information from school-submitted ACR self-evaluation form on April 27, 2015.