



Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
2014-2015

**GROWING UP GREEN CHARTER SCHOOL
ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW REPORT**

2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR

Part 1: School Overview

Charter Authorization Profile

Growing Up Green Charter School	
Authorized Grades	Kindergarten - Grade 8
Authorized Enrollment	756
School Opened For Instruction	2009-2010
Charter Term Expiration Date	June 30, 2017
Last Renewal Term Type	Short Term (3.5 years)

School Information for the 2014-2015 School Year

Growing Up Green Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Jeffrey Mueller
School Leader(s)	Matthew Greenberg
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 30
Borough(s) of Location	Queens
Physical Address(es)	39-27 28th Street, Long Island City, NY 11101 (Grades K-5)
	36-49 11th Street, Long Island City, NY 11101 (Grade 6)
Facility Owner(s)	Private
School Type	Elementary/Middle School
Grades Served 2014-2015	Kindergarten – Grade 8
Enrollment in 2014-2015*	600
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	Kindergarten
Additional Grade Level(s) for Which Student Applications for Admission are Accepted	Grades 1-5
Does School Enroll New Students Mid-Year	Yes
Number of Applicants for Admission	1,405
Number of Students Accepted via the Charter Lottery	594
Lottery Preferences (School Year 2014-2015)**	
Attends a Failing School	No
Does Not Speak English at Home	No
Receives SNAP or TANF Benefits	No
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch	No
Has IEP and/or Receives Special Education Services	No
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/charters/information/directory.htm>.

School Reported Current Key Design Elements	
Key Design Element	Description
Response to Intervention	Growing Up Green Charter School has a strong Response to Intervention (Rtl) process in place. Teachers identify struggling students through data and classroom observations and present a case-study to a group of colleagues. The Rtl process is upheld by a robust support staff in both the elementary and middle school including learning specialists, intervention teachers, school counselors, a behavior coordinator, and English Language Learner (ELL) specialists.
Professional Development	The school believes in the value of teachers attending external workshops and conferences that support student learning. To this end, as a school committed to Responsive Classroom and Developmental Designs, all teachers are trained in both these models. All new elementary teachers who have not previously been trained in Responsive Classroom attend The Responsive Classroom Summer Institute while all middle school teachers are trained in the Developmental Designs model.
Responsive Classroom and Developmental Designs	Responsive Classroom and its companion social curriculum in the middle school, Developmental Designs, are fundamental and centralizing forces within the school community. The school accomplishes this by creating a classroom and school-wide environment with routines and universal expectations. Through this established framework, students are empowered to be active participants in their own learning and the learning of their peers.
Special Education Program and Integrated Co-Teaching	The school has a comprehensive special education program which includes an Integrated Co-Teaching Classroom in each grade kindergarten through five, and a robust special education staff.
Project Based Learning	The school is committed to increasing learning opportunities for all students of every age and skill level by providing a well-rounded, integrated hands-on curriculum for all subject areas. The school's approaches include multi-media, field trips, math manipulatives, scientific experiments, art, writing, and many other rich experiential activities.
GREEN Character Development	The school builds character in students through the GREEN school culture. The core GREEN values of Giving back, Respect, Embrace, Empower, and Nurture are addressed on a daily basis and integrated into the school environment with the hope that they are embedded in the student's way of life both in the walls of the school and in the world outside.
Teacher Coaching	Every week teachers are provided with an additional prep period to meet with their direct supervisor. During this block of time teachers discuss observations that have taken place, SMART goals, specific data pertaining to students, and a variety of other topics.

Grade-Level Enrollment (School Year 2014-2015)		
Grade Level	Number of Students	Section Count
Kindergarten	87	3
Grade 1	84	3
Grade 2	85	3
Grade 3	84	3
Grade 4	85	3
Grade 5	85	3
Grade 6	90	4
Grade 7	-	-
Grade 8	-	-
Total Enrollment	600	22

* 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 the 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
Growing Up Green Charter School	27.8%	31.7%
CSD 30	30.0%	32.6%
Difference from CSD 30 *	-2.2	-0.9
NYC	27.7%	29.8%
Difference from NYC *	0.1	1.9
New York State **	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-3.3	1.1
% Proficient in Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Growing Up Green Charter School	28.6%	48.3%
CSD 30	36.8%	42.4%
Difference from CSD 30 *	-8.2	5.9
NYC	34.2%	39.1%
Difference from NYC *	-5.6	9.2
New York State **	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-2.5	12.1

* 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
Growing Up Green Charter School - All Students	58.0%	55.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	30.0%	22.3%
City Percent of Range - All Students	31.8%	23.0%
Growing Up Green Charter School - School's Lowest Third	72.0%	61.0%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	45.2%	11.4%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	40.4%	11.7%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Growing Up Green Charter School - All Students	73.0%	77.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	70.4%	83.2%
City Percent of Range - All Students	73.8%	84.2%
Growing Up Green Charter School - School's Lowest Third	71.0%	76.5%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	45.2%	70.3%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	41.9%	62.5%

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 *	16.7%	45.2%
English Language Learner Students	12.5%	20.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	57.1%	38.6%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	58.3%	64.5%
English Language Learner Students	37.5%	40.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	50.0%	54.9%

* 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, the school will show progress towards achieving 75% of third through eighth grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years performing at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA Exam.	Not Met
2. Each year, the school will show progress towards achieving 75% of third through eighth grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years performing at or above Level 3 on the NYS Math Exam.	Not Met
3. Each year, the school's Aggregate Performance Index on the NYS ELA Exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the NYS NCLB accountability system.	Met
4. Each year, the percent of all tested students in each grade level, grades three through eight, who perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA Exam will be greater than the percent of all students in Community School District 30 in the same tested grade who perform at or above Level 3.	Partially Met
5. Each year, grade-level cohorts of students (i.e. students who have been enrolled at the school for at least 2 consecutive BEDS dates) will reduce by one-quarter the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS ELA Exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS ELA Exam. If the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceeded 75% on the previous year's NYS ELA Exam, the grade level cohort is expected to demonstrate some growth (above 75%) in the current year.	Not Met
6. Each year, 75% of all students in grades one through eight who were enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive BEDS dates will perform at or above grade level on the NWEA MAP Reading test.	Not Met
7. Each year, grade-level cohorts of students (i.e. students who have been enrolled at the school for at least 2 consecutive BEDS dates) will reduce by one-quarter the gap between the average NCE score on the previous year's NWEA MAP Reading exam and an NCE of 50 for the current year's NWEA MAP exam by grade. If the average NCE score of a grade level cohort exceeded an NCE of 50 on the previous year's NWEA MAP Reading exam, the grade level cohort is expected to demonstrate some growth above an average NCE score of 50 in the current year.	Partially Met
8. Each year, 75% of all tested students in grades kindergarten through five who have been enrolled in the school for at least two consecutive BEDS dates will perform at or above grade level on the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System.	Partially Met
9. Each year, grade level cohorts of students in grades kindergarten through five who remained in the school for the entire year will show at least 3 levels of growth on the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System between September and June of each school year.	Partially 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.

Charter Goals		2013-2014
10.	Each year, the school's Aggregate Performance Index on the NYS Math Exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the NYS NCLB accountability system.	Met
11.	Each year, the percent of all tested students in each grade level, grades three through eight, who perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Math Exam will be greater than the percent of all students in Community School District 30 in the same tested grade who perform at or above Level 3.	Met
12.	Each year, grade-level cohorts of students (i.e. students who have been enrolled at the school for at least 2 consecutive BEDS dates) will reduce by one-quarter the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS Math Exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS Math Exam. If the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceeded 75% on the previous year's NYS Math Exam, the grade level cohort is expected to demonstrate some growth (above 75%) in the current year.	Met
13.	Each year, 75% of all students in grades one through eight who were enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive BEDS dates will perform at or above grade level on the NWEA MAP Math test.	Not Met
14.	Each year, grade-level cohorts of students (i.e. students who have been enrolled at the school for at least 2 consecutive BEDS dates) will reduce by one-quarter the gap between the average NCE score on the previous year's NWEA MAP Math exam and an NCE of 50 for the current year's NWEA MAP exam by grade. If the average NCE score of a grade level cohort exceeded an NCE of 50 on the previous year's NWEA MAP Math exam, the grade level cohort is expected to demonstrate some growth above an average NCE score of 50 in the current year.	Met
15.	Each year, the school will show progress towards achieving 75% of fourth and eighth grade students, who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years, performing at or above Level 3 on the NYS Science Exam.	Met
16.	Each year, the school will show progress towards earning a score of B or better on the "Progress" section of the NYC DOE Progress Report.	N/A
17.	Each year, the school will make AYP in Math, ELA and Science and will be deemed in "Good Standing" on its NYSED Report Card.	Met
18.	Each year, the school will have an average daily student attendance rate of at least 95%.	Not Met

Self-Reported Responsive Education Program & Learning Environment³

Curriculum Changes and/or Adjustments

- The school identified both ELA and Math as areas to improve for its most struggling of learners to be better served. Changes were implemented within both programs. The school utilizes the Read180 Reading and Writing Intervention program for struggling readers in grades four through six. In math, the curriculum was enVision Math and two math coordinators were hired, one for the lower school (grades kindergarten through two) and one for the upper school (grades three through six).
- Additionally, the school decreased class sizes in math in grades five and six by providing an intervention support teacher on a daily basis in fifth grade classrooms (to ensure small group lessons) and decreased class size from 28 to 23 in sixth grade math (to allow for more differentiation of curriculum and teaching approach). The school also decreased class sizes to 23 in English Language Arts (ELA) for sixth grade to ensure greater differentiation.
- The school cites the following practices toward its academic success: Integrated Co-teaching (ICT) program, Successful Student Committee, Response to Intervention, Implementation of Special Education services, and the reliability of the Looking Forward Looking Backward internal assessments. The school's Science performance on state tests indicates that the integrated approach in the Science Lab program has proven successful.

Interim Assessments

- In addition to a comprehensive program that combines direct instruction with exploratory, context driven projects, the school has a system to ensure the needs of all students are met: the Six-Week Assessment, Looking Forward Looking Back (LFLB) administered in both elementary and middle school.
- LFLB assessments are internal assessments, written by the Director of Assessment and Assessment Coordinators with support from the Directors of Curriculum and Instruction, Director of Special Education, Literacy Coordinator, Math Coordinators, Time Coordinators and classroom teachers. These assessments are created in advance of the school year based on Common Core Learning Standards and NYS exit standards. The LFLB are written using backward design, looking at the exit standards prior to exam creation.
- The school cites multiple benefits from use of this model.
 - The school is able to determine if students are meeting necessary grade level exit standards. If students are not meeting these exit standards, the compiled LFLB data will highlight an area for reflection: a need for curricular supplementation, a teacher performance issue, a class composition issue, or a grade-wide performance trend.
 - LFLB data allows the school to be self-aware, and because of this, students receive the highest quality instruction.

Approach to Data-Driven Instruction

- The school reports that students are continuing to progress as readers throughout the year. At the mid-year point, internal Fountas and Pinnell running record data indicated that on average 63% of students were reading at or above the benchmark level.
- The data from the school's October Northwest Evaluation Association testing shows that 53% of students are at or above grade level in both ELA and math.
- The school identified the rigor of its internal interim assessments, Looking Forward, Looking Back (LFLB) exams, as an area to work on, and added an additional Assessment Coordinator for the 2014-2015 school year. The department created improved LFLB with both increased rigor and alignment to Common Core Learning Standards and state exam formatting.

³ Self-reported information from school-submitted ACR self-evaluation form on May 15, 2015.

Philosophy on Special Education and English Language Learner Service Provision

- The school aims to meet all needs of students within the general education classroom. The school hosts a range of special education programs that provide a variety of support for students including one Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) class per grade.
- In ICT classes, students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) learn alongside their general education peers and are given the support of both a certified general education and special education teacher, allowing more small-group work and individualized attention.
- The school also provides Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) for students mandated for intensive small group instruction on key foundational skills in ELA and math. The special education department utilizes specialized curricula by way of multi-sensory programs including: Wilson Reading System, Foundations, Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention, Stern Mathematics and Lindamood Bell. Fourth and fifth grade ICT classes use Scholastic's Read 180 to improve struggling learners' reading comprehension, vocabulary, and writing skills. Support teachers adapt these programs to meet the needs of learners.
- The school works with related services therapists to provide students with services they require and to ensure that all providers are working toward student goals, collaborating with classroom teachers, and sharing student progress with families.
- The ELL team of teachers employ sheltered instruction (SDAIE - Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English) techniques to support and differentiate instruction for ELL students.

Professional Development Opportunities

- The following internal professional development opportunities were provided to teachers:
 - Two-Week Summer professional development;
 - Weekly Coaching Meetings with Supervisors;
 - Weekly Staff Meetings;
 - Weekly Grade Team or Department Planning Meetings; and
 - Monthly Math and Literacy Workshops.
- The following external professional development opportunities were provided to teachers:
 - Responsive Classroom Training for grades kindergarten through five (weeklong summer institutes);
 - Development Designs Training for Middle School Staff;
 - Charter Center Special Education Collaborative Workshops (various topics);
 - Literacy Professional Development from Lesley University (Guided Reading for 3-5 Workshop) and Bank Street;
 - Grow to Learn NYC - Grant Writing and Garden Design and Indoor Garden tour hydroponics workshop;
 - Sounds in Motion;
 - NSTA (National Science Teacher Association) Regional Conference in Orlando and National Conference in Orlando;
 - City College - Math in the City (various workshops); and
 - Everyone Reading - Really Great Reading.

Teacher Evaluation

- Teachers are formally observed and reviewed twice by supervisors. Supervisors complete a yearly Professional Evaluation for each teacher taking into account all observed lessons (formal and informal) as well as performance of both teaching practice and professional responsibilities throughout the year.
- Teacher evaluation is intimately linked with professional development as evaluation is considered part and parcel of professional development as means to support, build and strengthen the instructional capacity of individual teachers. The coaching program provides highly individualized support for each teacher, thereby strengthening the applicable nature of the teacher evaluation process.
- Every teacher is partnered with a "coach", one of the instructional administrative leaders at the school. At the beginning of the school year the teacher and coach collaboratively review the teacher's Professional Growth Survey, and establish goals for the year. The completed and

reviewed Professional Growth Survey informs the coaching plan between the teacher and his or her coach. Teachers have weekly coaching meetings that take place during a period of extra prep-time. Coaches ensure that teachers are additionally supported in their goals through work with other instructional leaders, peers (through grade team meetings, staff meetings, peer observations, classroom demonstration sites), literacy, math and social studies staff developers and workshops.

Differentiated Instruction

- The school has various structures in place to allow for differentiated instruction:
 - The workshop model allows teachers to pull small groups of students during the independent work portion.
 - ICT classrooms have two teachers, which allows for different teaching models and structures for support.
 - Intervention teachers provide additional supports for struggling students in grades kindergarten through five.
 - The Read 180 Literacy program is offered for students below grade level in grades four through six.
 - All non-ICT kindergarten and first grade classrooms are staffed by a lead and associate teacher allowing for a wider array of teaching models.
 - Fifth grade classes have a consistent second math teacher pushing in daily to allow for small group math instruction.
 - Curriculum content is differentiated via unit structure, homework, and student/teacher materials.

Adjustments Based on 2013-2014 Data

- 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:
 - The school provided students and teachers with more opportunities for unpacking math content and deepening their mathematical understandings. The school made two changes in the math program.
 - The school added two math coordinators to the staff. During the 2014-2015 school year there was a math coordinator for students in grades kindergarten through two and another for math coordinator for students in grades three through six that helped support teachers' mathematical teaching pedagogy by leading professional development, modeling best practices, and co-teaching in classrooms.
 - The school also integrated the enVision math program to its current Investigations curriculum published by TERC.
 - The six-week assessments were adjusted to be better aligned to the benchmark goals of the Common Core Learning Standards and refined practices in the test creation process and use of the data to guide instruction.

Learning Environment

- The school uses the principles of Responsive Classroom universally as the social curriculum and guiding force of school culture, as well as the backbone to promote professional engagement and growth among teachers. The school believes these principles have supported and empowered teachers, given them a voice in instructional decision-making and professional growth, as well as provided them with opportunities to build their capacities and take on expanded roles within the school community.

NYC DOE School Visit

Representatives of the OSDCP team visited the school on June 3, 2015. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

School Leadership

- Teachers are provided with a 25 minute coaching block during which the Director of Instruction meets with teachers to assess data and group students based on reading levels. The Director of Instruction guides Associate Teachers as they work on their goals. Teachers submit lesson plans for weekly review; lesson plans are also shared with ELL specialists and different service providers.
- The school has a Director of Curriculum who oversees curriculum coordinators in math and ELA. The school has also hired a literacy coordinator for grades kindergarten through two who will begin in the 2015-2016 school year.
- The school is completing a two-and-a-half year process of looking at its math curriculum. The preliminary findings led to the development of a math committee and the incorporation of enVision with TERC Investigations.
- The school implemented Read 180 as an intervention program and identified 50 students for that program.

Classroom Observations

- Seven classrooms were observed. In all classrooms transitions were orderly and students were aware of behavioral rules and expectations. All classroom environments were safe and respectful.
- Approximately half of all classrooms visited had prepared materials for students.
- All classrooms displayed recent student work.
- Approximately half of all classrooms visited has interdisciplinary connections in their lessons; in most classrooms there was evidence that students understood the lesson and the tasks at hand.
- Differentiation was observed through materials and tasks in a few of the classrooms.
- All classrooms had assessments that were aligned to lesson objectives and all checks for upstanding supported all students.
- More than half of all classrooms visited had students self-assess and nearly all teachers' lessons showed evidence of data to inform their instruction.

Teacher Interviews

- Seven teachers were interviewed and all agreed that data is used to drive instruction.
- Six teachers said they were formally observed twice a year; three of these teachers also noted that they were informally observed on a weekly basis.
- Four teachers said they were involved in professional development on a monthly basis; two teachers indicated that they were not satisfied with the quality of professional development they had received.
- Four teachers said they felt they had sufficient resources to teach their 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. Director of Upper School Instruction	Lauren Barkan	5
2. Director of Special Education	Megan Bloom	6
3. School Leader	Matthew Greenberg	6
4. Director of Counseling	Kristen Lengyel	5
5. Director of Assessment	Brian Martin	6
6. Director of Operations	Massomeh Muhammad	3
7. Director of Finance	Gina Palma	4
8. Director of Curriculum and Language Arts Coordinator	Jennifer Slutak	6
9. Director of Lower School Instruction	Brittany Tuber	6
10. Middle School Coordinator	Stephanie Sherin	1

Board of Trustees (School Year 2014-2015)		
Board Member Name	Position- <i>Committees</i>	Was all Documentation Submitted to OSDCP? Was Board Member Approved by OSDCP?
1. Jeffrey Mueller	Board Chair- <i>Finance Committee, Real Estate Committee</i>	Yes
2. Kyla Kupferstein	Vice Chair- <i>Education Committee, Fundraising Committee</i>	Yes
3. Reid Chase	Treasurer- <i>Finance Committee, Real Estate Committee</i>	Yes
4. Kurt Shuman	Secretary- <i>Finance Committee, Real Estate Committee</i>	Yes
5. Kate Hooker	Board Member- <i>Education Committee, Fundraising Committee</i>	Yes
6. Malabika Das	Parent Representative- <i>Fundraising Committee</i>	No

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. Finance Committee	Yes	No
2. Fundraising Committee	Yes	No
3. Education Committee	Yes	No
4. Real Estate Committee	Yes	No

School Climate & Community Engagement

Growing Up Green Charter School	
Instructional Staff Turnover (School Year 2013-2014)*	9.3%
Instructional Staff Turnover (School Year 2014-2015)**	13.6%
Number of Instructional Staff Members Not Returning from the Previous Academic Year*	9
Does the School have a Parent Organization?	Yes
• If Yes, how many times did it meet (School Year 2013-2014)?	12
• If Yes, how many parents attended these meetings?	20
Average Daily Attendance Rate (School Year 2013-2014)***	94.0%

* 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 rate is self-reported information from the school-submitted ACR self-evaluation form on May 15, 2015. The school's average daily attendance rate was not available in ATS for Growing Up Green Charter School in 2013-2014.

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree				
Survey Question		Growing Up Green Charter School		Citywide Average
		2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students*	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.**	-	-	-
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	-	-	-
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	-	-	-
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	97%	96%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	97%	95%	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.	100%	93%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	96%	98%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	96%	93%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.	96%	100%	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*	Growing Up Green Charter School **	-	-
	NYC	-	-
Parents	Growing Up Green Charter School	60%	68%
	NYC	54%	53%
Teachers	Growing Up Green Charter School	96%	95%
	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)	101 days	Strong
Liabilities	School's position to meet liabilities expected over the next 12 months	Cash flow sufficient to cover 100% of liabilities (ratio should be greater than or equal to 1.00)	5.0	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	0.05	Strong
	Did the school operate at a surplus or deficit during the past three fiscal years?	Value should be greater than 0.00	0.20	Strong
Ratios	Debt to Asset Ratio	Ratio should be less than 1.00	0.21	Strong
	Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Ratio should be greater than 1.00	N/A	N/A
Cash Flow	Most recent fiscal year's cash flow	Value should be greater than 0.00	\$476,888	Strong
	Trend of cash flow over the past three fiscal years	Value should be greater than 0.00	\$1,066,957	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	No less than 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?	No; board minutes from the 2014-2015 school year are not posted on the school's website.
Number of Board Meetings in the 2014-2015 School Year with a Quorum of Board Members Present / Number Meetings Required per Bylaws**	0 / 7

* 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 ⁴	Yes
Employee Fingerprinting	Yes
Safety Plan/Emergency Drill	No
Immunization Record ⁵	No
Insurance	No
Lottery	Yes
Annual Report Submitted to SED 2013-2014	Yes
Financial Audit Posted 2013-2014	Yes

⁴ 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.

⁵ The Department of Health standards require an immunization rate of 99%.

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:
66	7	10.6%	59	89.4%	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	No
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)	No	N/A
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	Yes	No
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: 11 (2%) Out of School Suspensions: 16 (2%)	

*Suspensions during the 2014-2015 school year as of April 1, 2015

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, Growing Up Green Charter School served:
 - a lower 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, Growing Up Green 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)	Growing Up Green Charter School	66.9%	63.2%
	Effective Target	85.7%	86.9%
	Difference from Effective Target	-18.8	-23.7
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Growing Up Green Charter School	21.1%	19.2%
	Effective Target	12.3%	12.5%
	Difference from Effective Target	+8.8	+6.7
English Language Learners (ELL)	Growing Up Green Charter School	14.6%	16.5%
	Effective Target	33.8%	33.4%
	Difference from Effective Target	-19.2	-16.9

Retention of Special Populations

Special Population		2013-2014	2014-2015
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	Growing Up Green Charter School	86.6%	N/A
	Effective Target	82.9%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+3.8	-
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Growing Up Green Charter School	79.8%	N/A
	Effective Target	78.4%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+1.4	-
English Language Learners (ELL)	Growing Up Green Charter School	90.3%	N/A
	Effective Target	79.9%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+10.4	-

Enrollment Information Used to Generate Targets		
	2013-2014	2014-2015
Grades Served	K-5	K-6
Enrollment	492	600
CSD(s)	30	30

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:

- Growing up Green Charter School will continue with the approved charter to serve students in grades kindergarten through eight. Growing up Green Charter School will reach scale serving students in grades kindergarten through eight in the 2016-2017 school year.