



Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
2013-2014

**NEW YORK CITY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL FOR ARCHITECTURE,
ENGINEERING, AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRIES
ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW REPORT**

2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR

Part 1: School Overview

School Information for the 2013-2014 School Year

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Name of Charter School | NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries |
| Board Chair(s) | Carlo Schiattarella |
| School Leader(s) | Eugene Foley |
| Management Company (if applicable) | Victory Education Partners |
| Other Partner(s) | N/A |
| District(s) of Location | NYC Community School District 7 |
| Physical Address(es) | 838 Brook Avenue, Bronx 10451 |
| Facility Owner(s) | Private |

School Profile

- NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI) is a high school, which served 450 students¹ in grades 9-12 during the 2013-2014 school year and is fully at scale. It opened in 2008-2009, and is under the terms of its second charter. The school is located in privately-operated facilities in the Bronx within Community School District (CSD) 7.²
- AECI enrolls new students in grade 9, and backfills empty seats in grades 10 through 12. There were 181 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2013 lottery.³ The average attendance rate for the 2013-2014 school year as reported in January 2014 was 87%.⁴
- AECI was renewed during the 2012-2013 school year for short-term renewal period of three years with conditions, and is consistent with the terms of its renewal application. The conditions of renewal are as follows:
 - Increase college readiness index measure, earning a minimum C grade each year of the new charter term.⁵
 - Improve 4-year Graduation Rate by scoring in the 50th percentile or above of peer schools on the NYC DOE Progress Report within two years after renewal.
 - Improve the percent of Students Earning Regents Diploma rate by scoring in the 50th percentile or above of peer schools on the NYC DOE Progress Report within two years after renewal. The peer group is determined by the NYC DOE Progress Report.
- The 2013-2014 school leadership team included Eugene Foley, Principal; Maurice Borenstein, Assistant Principal; David Cullen, Assistant Principal; and Dania Valdez-Castro, Director of Operations. The Principal has been with the school since April 2009.
- AECI is partnered with Victory Education Partners, a service provider. Victory Education Partners provides academic support and evaluation, back office support, curriculum assessment and student assessment data gathering, among other financial supportive services. The school pays an annual flat fee to the service provider for these services.
- AECI had a student to teacher ratio of 15:1 in the 2013-2014 school year, and served 183 sections across all grades, with an average class size of 20.6.⁶
- The lottery preferences for AECI's 2013-2014 school year included the New York State Charter Schools Act required preferences of returning students, students residing in the community school district of the school's location, and siblings of students already enrolled in the charter school.⁷

¹ Enrollment reflects ATS data from 10/31/13.

² NYC DOE Location Code Generation and Management System database.

³ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 1/31/14.

⁴ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 1/31/14.

⁵ Beginning with the 2013-14 school year, the NYC DOE Progress Report will be replaced with the NYC DOE School Quality Report. The School Quality Report is not graded.

⁶ Self-reported information given on 9/16/14.

⁷ NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering, and Construction Industries' 2013-2014 application.

Part 2: Summary of Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the school an academic success?

Overview of School-Specific Data through 2012-2013

| 4-year Graduation Rate | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI) | - | - | 67.3% | 65.6% |
| NYC | 65.1% | 65.5% | 64.7% | 66.0% |
| Difference from NYC | - | - | 2.6 | -0.4 |
| 6-year Graduation Rate | | | | |
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI) | - | - | - | - |
| NYC | 69.2% | 70.9% | 73.2% | 73.0% |
| Difference from NYC | - | - | - | - |
| College Readiness Index** - 4 years | | | | |
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI) | - | - | 4.0% | 3.3% |
| Peer Percent of Range | - | - | 16.3% | 11.7% |
| City Percent of Range | - | - | 9.2% | 7.1% |

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 or city.

** The College Readiness Index score was not introduced until the 2011-2012 school year.

Credit Accumulation

| % 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI) | 79.7% | 83.5% | 89.9% | 90.6% |
| Peer Percent of Range | 56.2% | 70.0% | 80.4% | 88.3% |
| City Percent of Range | 64.2% | 69.7% | 79.8% | 79.2% |
| % 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits | | | | |
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI) | 82.2% | 73.6% | 80.7% | 83.5% |
| Peer Percent of Range | 68.0% | 57.6% | 70.0% | 84.8% |
| City Percent of Range | 70.0% | 54.9% | 64.5% | 68.3% |
| % 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits | | | | |
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI) | - | 77.7% | 75.4% | 77.4% |
| Peer Percent of Range | - | 72.4% | 64.1% | 73.9% |
| City Percent of Range | - | 63.7% | 56.5% | 58.7% |

* 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 or city.

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

| Progress Report Grade | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Overall Grade | - | - | B | B |
| Student Progress | - | - | B | B |
| Student Performance | - | - | C | C |
| School Environment | - | - | C | B |
| College and Career Readiness* | - | - | F | D |
| Closing the Achievement Gap Points | - | - | 3.8 | 3.0 |

* The College and Career Readiness grade was not introduced until the 2011-2012 school year.

Progress Towards Attainment of Academic Goals

- According to its 2012-2013 Annual Report to the New York State Education Department (NYSED), AECI fully met three, partially met two, and did not meet four of its nine applicable academic performance goals identified in its charter.

Responsive Education Program & Learning Environment⁸

- The 2013-2014 school year was the first year the school implemented the Judith Hochman Teaching Basic Writing Skills Curriculum through multiple disciplines. This incorporated more writing and text-based learning over the school year.
 - The implementation of the Judith Hochman Teaching Basic Writing Skills Curriculum was supported by hours of professional training, visitations, and curriculum building.
- A series of courses were created to help students who did not pass the Regents exam including courses in Science, Math Seminar, and Global Studies Seminar.
- The school provides after school programs, including the ACE program and READ mentor reading program.
- The school implemented data programs, such as GradeCam, to deliver interim assessments that are Common Core aligned.
- The school has developed a structured baseline and interim assessment schedule, including mock Regents tests, for each content area.
- An ELA and a math academic coach were hired to work with struggling learners.
- The school provides Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) to students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) or 504 plans.
- The school provides English Language Learners (ELLs) with a scheduled class and/or pull out services.
- Faculty receives several hours of professional development and training each week during school hours.
- Teachers have common planning time to map out curriculum, unit plans, and individual lessons using the Understanding by Design (UBD) format.
- School leadership formally observes teachers four times a school year using the Danielson method, including pre- and post-observation conferences. Informal observations and peer observations are also conducted to identify strengths and weaknesses in individual teaching practice.

Representatives of the NYC DOE team visited the school on June 10, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- School leadership reported that:
 - The school has increased the number of guidance counselors (one for each grade level/cohort) to help support students' social development and academic needs. The counselor spirals with the cohorts to build long-term relationships. The school leadership team believes that this will help students be more academically successful.
 - The school has implemented a new college readiness program where students have the ability to take a course called SUPA (Syracuse University Project Advance). The course provides AECE students an opportunity to graduate with three (3) college credits. This is in addition to the existing partnerships with College Now and Jump Start. The school believes that because SUPA can be programmed into the students' regular day that more students will be able to participate in the program.
 - The school has added a full-time college advisory consultant who presents to students on credit accumulation and college readiness issues.
 - The school has continued to focus on Regents' preparation by focusing on revising the curriculum maps and unit plans to continue to strengthen classroom instruction.
- Nine classrooms across all grades and content areas were observed by members of the visit team and the following was noted:
 - Most of the classrooms were taught by one instructor; although three classrooms had two teachers present following a lead and assist model. In half of the classrooms, independent practice was observed. Class size varied from 16 to 20 students.

⁸ Self-reported information from school-submitted self-evaluation form on 3/10/14.

- In most classrooms, questioning was used to check for understanding. Questions ranged from basic recall, to challenging students to demonstrate understanding, to challenging students to synthesize and evaluate, depending on the class.
 - Based on debriefs with instructional leaders after classroom visits, most classrooms had instruction that was aligned with the school's instructional model and current academic priorities.
- On the day of the visit, one-on-one interviews were conducted with six teachers, two academic coaches, and the Director of Student Success and Family, and the following was noted:
 - Most staff interviewed reported that they received both informal and formal observations, based on the Danielson model, from the instructional leadership. They reported having both the pre- and post-observation meetings to discuss areas of improvement.
 - Most staff interviewed reported the use of interim and summative assessments, including mock Regents, projects, and unit tests. They also discussed the use of Grade Cam to dissect exams and review itemized assessments.
 - All staff interviewed reported weekly professional development held at the school. Some of the sessions mentioned included: SmartBoard use, classroom environment, writing program, and data review.

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

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

After reviewing information and documentation concerning Board turnover, Board minutes, reporting structure, organizational chart, annual accountability reporting documents, Board agendas, and the school's website, the NYC DOE notes the following:

- The Board has six voting board members. The Board Chair, Carlo Schiatterella, has been on the Board since February 2012.
- As evidenced from a review of Board rosters, the Board did not experience any turnover in members during the 2013-2014 school year.
- As recorded in the Board's minutes, there is a clear reporting structure with school leadership providing regular updates on academic and operational performance to the Board and its committees.
- Some Board minutes and agenda items have been provided via the school's website for inspection by the public.

School Climate & Community Engagement

After reviewing information and documentation concerning leadership turnover, staff turnover, attendance rate, student turnover, NYC School Survey results and response rates, and PTO meetings, the NYC DOE notes the following:

- The school experienced no leadership turnover during the 2013-2014 school year.
- Instructional staff turnover was 65.6% with 16 out of 32 instructional staff choosing not to return for the 2013-14 school year from the prior year, and five instructional staff who were asked not to return. As of January 2014, during the 2013-14 school year no teachers had left the school.⁹
- As of January 2014, average daily attendance for students was at 87%, which is lower than the school's charter goal of at least 95%.¹⁰
- Student turnover was 4.2% of students from the prior school year who did not return at the start of the 2013-2014 school year and 3.2% of the students left the school between the start of the 2013-2014 school year and January 2014.¹¹
- The school reported having a parent teacher organization (PTO), as evidenced in the school's Board minutes.

2012-2013 NYC School Survey Results¹²

| Categories | Result | | Community | Response Rate | Citywide Rate |
|-----------------------|---------------|--|-----------|---------------|---------------|
| Academic Expectations | Average | | Parents | 52% | 54% |
| Communication | Average | | Teachers | 97% | 83% |
| Engagement | Below Average | | Students | 95% | 83% |
| Safety & Respect | Average | | | | |

⁹ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 1/31/14.

¹⁰ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 1/31/14.

¹¹ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 1/31/14.

¹² Results are particular to the school type as identified in the 2013 School Survey.

Financial Health

Near-term financial obligations:

- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's current ratio indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash to cover its operating expenses for at least two months without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-14 budget to the actual enrollment at the end of the school year indicated that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY13 financial audit, the school had met its debt obligations.

Financial sustainability based on current practices:

- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY13, the school generated an aggregate surplus over the three audited fiscal years, and in FY13 the school operated at a surplus.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from FY11 through FY13, the school generated overall positive cash flow from FY11 to FY13 and the school had positive cash flow in each measurable year.

Annual Independent Financial Audit

- An independent audit performed for FY13 showed no material findings.

Essential Question 3: Compliance with charter and all applicable laws and regulations?

After a review of documentation submitted for the NYC DOE annual accountability reporting requirements for the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE finds the following:

Board Compliance

The Board is in compliance with:

- The Board's membership size with six Board members, falls within the range of no fewer than five and no greater than eleven, as outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws.
- Currently, officer positions outlined in the Board's bylaws are filled.

The Board is out of compliance with:

- The Board has not held the minimum number of at least 10 Board meetings during the school year, as outlined in its bylaws. Based on submitted Board minutes, the Board held eight meetings for the 2013-2014 school year in which quorum was reached.

School Compliance

The school is in compliance with (as of May 2014):

- All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.
- The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is compliant with state requirements for teacher certification.
- The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.
- The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization.
- The school had an application deadline of April 1, 2014 and lottery date of April 7, 2014 adhering to charter law's requirement of accepting applications up to at least April 1.
- The school leader was trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.

The school is out of compliance with:

- The school has not posted its 2012-13 NYSED Annual Report and annual audit to its website, as specified in charter law as of May 2014.

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:

- AECI's Board of Trustees continues to seek a facility that would provide the space to implement the creative and additional academic programming the school wants to offer.

Enrollment and Retention Targets

As a reminder regarding accountability in the next charter term:

- Amendments to Article 56 of the New York State Consolidated Laws: Education, which relates to Charter Schools, call for charter schools, as a consideration of renewal, "to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets" for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program. The amendments further indicate "Repeated failure to comply with the requirement" as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.
 - The law directs schools to demonstrate "that it has made extensive efforts to recruit and retain such students" in the event it has not yet met its targets.
 - The NYC DOE, as authorizer, will annually monitor the school's performance against these targets and the efforts it makes to meet this state requirement.
- In school year 2013-2014, AECI served a higher percentage of students who qualified for free or reduced price lunch and English Language Learners compared to CSD 7 and citywide averages. The school served a smaller percentage of students with disabilities compared to CSD 7 but a comparable percentage to the citywide average.

Special Populations

| | Free and Reduced Price Lunch | | | | | Students with Disabilities | | | | | English Language Learners | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 |
| School | 78.7% | 86.7% | 94.7% | 92.3% | 89.3% | 12.1% | 13.0% | 11.3% | 11.5% | 14.9% | 11.3% | 12.4% | 13.3% | 15.3% | 16.2% |
| CSD 7 | 79.8% | 80.5% | 82.1% | 85.1% | 83.9% | 17.2% | 17.1% | 17.4% | 18.7% | 18.9% | 14.5% | 14.3% | 14.1% | 14.8% | 13.7% |
| NYC | 60.8% | 62.7% | 65.7% | 68.2% | 71.1% | 12.7% | 13.1% | 13.6% | 14.2% | 14.8% | 12.1% | 12.6% | 12.5% | 12.1% | 11.9% |

| Additional Enrollment Information | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 |
| Grades Served | 9-10 | 9-11 | 9-12 | 9-12 | 9-12 |
| CSD(s) | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |

Comparisons to both the CSD(s) and City are made against students in grades K-8, 9-12 or K-12 depending on the grades the school served in each school year. Special population figures are as of October 31 for each given school year, with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.