



Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships  
2014-2015

**NYC CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL FOR ARCHITECTURE, ENGINEERING,  
AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRIES (AECI)  
ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW REPORT**

**2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR**

## Part 1: School Overview

### Charter Authorization Profile

NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)	
Authorized Grades	Grades 9-12
Authorized Enrollment	400
School Opened For Instruction	2007-2008
Charter Term Expiration Date	June 30, 2016
Last Renewal Term Type	Short Term (3 years)

### School Information for the 2014-2015 School Year

NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)	
Board Chair(s)	Carlo Schiattarella
School Leader(s)	Charles Gallo
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 7
Borough(s) of Location	Bronx
Physical Address(es)	838 Brook Avenue, Bronx, NY 10451
Facility Owner(s)	Private
School Type	High School
Grades Served 2014-2015	Grades 9-12
Enrollment in 2014-2015*	441
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 9
Additional Grade Level(s) for Which Student Applications for Admission are Accepted	None
Does School Enroll New Students Mid-Year	Yes
Number of Applicants for Admission	425
Number of Students Accepted via the Charter Lottery	225
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)	<u>Service Provider:</u> Victory Education Partners <u>Other Support Organizations:</u> Lead On Inc. and CPET Teachers College
Services Provided	Victory Education Partners - Budget and Financial Services, Human Resources, Operations Lead On Inc. - Leadership development, support for systems and structures for higher student outcomes, teacher coaching, Professional Development CPET Teachers College - Teacher Professional Development
Management Fee	Victory Education Partners - \$171,948 Lead On Inc. - \$126,450 CPET Teachers College - \$7,200

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
Themed Classes	The instructional program at NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering, and Construction Industries (AECI) has been modified to integrate key features and the vision of AECI's philosophy. The architecture, engineering, and construction program allows students to become familiar with several facets of the architecture, engineering and construction industries. These courses emphasize key knowledge and skills required to successfully enter a variety of architecture, engineering and construction related fields as well as the pertinent safety issues.
Judith Hochman Writing Program	The Hochman Writing Program focuses on writing skills and is incorporated in all content areas. Teachers receive professional development and analyze student writing samples to adjust instruction.
College Readiness Focus	The school builds and continues to grow dual credit courses allowing students to simultaneously receive high school and college credit. It is expanding Syracuse University's Project Advance (SUPA) classes to include Sports Management, College Learning Strategies, and Public Affairs. The school is also increasing the number of higher level math and science courses for upper level students and the number of students taking College Now courses and Jump Start courses. Kaplan SAT prep class is available for all juniors.
Powerful Use of On-Going Assessments and Data	The school has implemented data programs using software packages including (but not limited) to Study Island, GradeCam, and Problem-Attic to deliver and proactively address student strengths and weaknesses via a built-in interim assessment schedule, including mock Regents that are Common Core aligned.
Common Planning Time for Teachers	Teacher schedules have been designed to allow teacher teams to meet daily grade level structures. Teachers discuss curriculum development, data based instruction, the Hochman Writing Program, and the Danielson Framework for Teaching.
Curriculum Mapping	Teachers have common planning time to map out curriculum, unit and lesson plans using the Understanding By Design (UBD) planning formats. Teachers have been trained in the use of Atlas, a software based online program that will house their curriculum maps.
Ongoing Professional Development for All Staff	Faculty receives many hours of professional development, beginning with a two week intensive pre-service training. Throughout the year teachers receive professional development opportunities in grade teams and full faculty sessions.

Grade-Level Enrollment (School Year 2014-2015)		
Grade Level	Number of Students	Section Count
Grade 9	135	5
Grade 10	111	4
Grade 11	92	4
Grade 12	103	4
Total Enrollment	441	17

\* 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.

---

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

##### HS Performance Compared to Peer and NYC Averages

4-year Graduation Rate		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>65.6%</b>	<b>76.6%</b>
NYC *	66.0%	68.4%
Difference from NYC	-0.4	8.2
6-year Graduation Rate		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>82.2%</b>
NYC *	-	72.7%
Difference from NYC	-	9.5
College and Career Preparatory Course Index **		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>13.1%</b>	<b>76.6%</b>
Peer Percent of Range	19.2%	100.0%
City Percent of Range	17.1%	100.0%

\* The New York State graduation rate calculation method was first adopted in NYC for the Cohort of 2001 (Class of 2005). The cohort consists of all students who first entered ninth grade in a given school year (e.g., the Cohort of 2005 entered ninth grade in the 2005-2006 school year). Graduates are defined as those students earning either a Local or Regents diploma and exclude those earning either a special education (IEP) diploma or GED.

\*\* 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.

### Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>90.6%</b>	<b>88.4%</b>
Peer Percent of Range	88.3%	75.3%
City Percent of Range	79.2%	74.0%
% 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>83.5%</b>	<b>89.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range	84.8%	91.0%
City Percent of Range	68.3%	79.3%
% 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>77.4%</b>	<b>88.7%</b>
Peer Percent of Range	73.9%	91.3%
City Percent of Range	58.7%	80.0%

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.

### Regents Pass Rates

NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Integrated Algebra	75.6%	72.0%
Algebra 2 / Trigonometry	N/A	N/A
Comprehensive English	84.3%	84.3%
U.S. History	57.6%	49.5%
Chemistry	N/A	N/A
Physics	N/A	N/A
Living Environment	53.8%	58.6%
Language Other Than English	N/A	N/A

## Closing the Achievement Gap

4-year Weighted Diploma Rate*		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities **	200.0%	218.2%
English Language Learner Students	142.9%	231.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	125.0%	215.5%
College and Career Preparatory Course Index		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	0.0%	59.5%

\* The weighted diploma rate assigns a weight to each type of diploma based on the relative level of proficiency and college and career readiness indicated by the diploma type and based on certain student demographic characteristics.

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

**Progress Towards Attainment of Academic Goals in 2013-2014<sup>2</sup>**

<b>Academic Goals</b>	
<b>Authorizer Mandated Goals</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
1. Increase college readiness index measure, earning a minimum C grade each year of the new charter term.	N/A
2. 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.	N/A
3. 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.	N/A
<b>Charter Goals</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
1. Each year, 75% of each ninth through twelfth grade cohort will pass the NYS Regents ELA Exam.	<b>Met</b>
2. Each year, 75% of each ninth through twelfth grade cohort will pass the NYS Regents Math Exam.	<b>Met</b>
3. Each year, each cohort of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent passing the NYS Regents ELA Exam and the previous cohorts' passing rate on the NYS Regents ELA Exam.	<b>Met</b>
4. Each year, each cohort of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent passing the NYS Regents Math Exam and the previous cohorts' passing rate on the NYS Regents Math Exam.	<b>Met</b>
5. Each year, the percent of each cohort of students passing the NYS Regents ELA Exam will place the school in the top quartile of all similar schools.	N/A
6. Each year, the percent of each cohort of students passing the NYS Regents Math Exam will place the school in the top quartile of all similar schools.	N/A
7. Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the NYS ELA Exam will meet its Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.	<b>Met</b>
8. Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the NYS Math Exam will meet its Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.	<b>Met</b>
9. Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the NYS Science Exam will meet its Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.	N/A
10. Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the NYS Social Studies Exam will meet its Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.	N/A
11. Each year, at least 75% of each student cohort graduates after five years.	<b>Met</b>
12. Each year, 75% of students enrolled in the school for two or more years will perform at or above 65 on the NYS Regents Science Exams (Living Environment and Chemistry).	<b>Partially Met</b>
13. Each year, 75% of students enrolled in the school for two or more years will perform at or above 65 on the NYS Regents Social Studies Exams (U.S. History & Government and Global History & Geography).	<b>Partially Met</b>
14. Each year, the school will have a daily student attendance rate of at least 95%.	<b>Not Met</b>

<sup>2</sup> 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 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 Environment<sup>3</sup>

### Curriculum Changes and/or Adjustments

- The Global History curriculum for tenth grade students was changed to a one year double period course based on our previous Global Regents results.
- The ELA curriculum is supported by the Hochman Writing Program and has been integrated in all subject classes.

### Interim Assessments

- Assessments used at the school include the following:
  - Mock Regents in all content areas;
  - Benchmark assessments in all subjects given at specific times throughout the school year; and
  - In-class, teacher-developed assessments in all classes.

### Approach to Data-Driven Instruction

- Teacher teams meet three times per week to collaborate on unit plans, lesson plans and student inquiry.
- Using the various interim assessments given throughout the year, teachers examine student trends and patterns and adjust their curriculum accordingly.
- Teachers maintain data binders in which they keep summary benchmark reports, samples of student work, rubrics for student assignments and other sources of student data.

### Philosophy on Special Education and English Language Learner Service Provision

- The school's philosophy focuses on providing the least restrictive environment for all special education students. To support that, the school has special education teachers who work closely with students on all academic and character development issues.
- The school also has an in-house social worker in addition to four guidance counselors to better serve the needs of both students with disabilities and English Language Learners.
- Teachers are aware of the diversified learners in their classes and during observations demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the needs of each student.
- The special education team has worked closely with the entire staff in sharing students' Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) so that every teacher has easy access to these documents in the planning and preparation of their daily lessons.
- Teacher lesson plan templates include differentiation and modifications for both English Language Learners and students with disabilities.

### Professional Development Opportunities

- Teachers were provided with multiple professional development opportunities over the course of the year. Topics covered included the following:
  - The Hochman Writing Program;
  - Questioning and discussion techniques;
  - Analysis of Regents data;
  - Danielson Framework for Teaching; and
  - Goal-setting workshops.

### Teacher Evaluation

- Teachers are formally observed four times a year by the Principal and Assistant Principal.
- Informal observations are done throughout the year with meaningful verbal feedback given to teachers; feedback includes next steps and action items so teachers can improve their effectiveness rate.
- Evaluations are done based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching and include both pre-observation and post-observation conferences. This is a three-day process in which teachers are

---

<sup>3</sup> Self-reported information from school-submitted ACR self-evaluation form on May 1, 2015.

given an opportunity to reflect on student data, contemplate their own teaching practices, reflect on their teaching, and discuss progress toward achieving their goals for the current school year.

#### Differentiated Instruction

- All teachers have been trained on differentiation with a focus on content, process, and product.
- Teachers focus on adjusting complexity of content, applying knowledge of ability levels and learning styles, and differentiating student products to provide different opportunities for students to demonstrate knowledge.
- Lesson plan templates were revised in 2014-2015 to include a differentiation section that contains Grouping, Tiers, Special Education, and English Language Learner extensions.

#### 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 adjusted its Global classes in tenth grade to incorporate a double period of Global History and Geography.
- The English department partnered with the Social Studies team to infuse the Hochman Writing Program into the curriculum in order to provide students with the skills needed for the essays on the exam.
- The school provided support by offering before- and after-school prep classes in addition to a Saturday Academy.
- The school implemented an SAT prep class for juniors taught by Kaplan in an effort to raise SAT scores.
- The school hired a science coach to work with all science teachers to provide the support necessary to strengthen pedagogical skills, support curriculum development and improve student outcomes.
- Students were provided with math tutoring both before and after school in order to gain a higher understanding of math concepts.

#### Learning Environment

According to the NYC School Survey Report for the 2013-2014 school year, School Culture approval ratings by parents were 93%, 87% by teachers, and 82% by students. The Student Handbook is distributed every year to students so they are aware of the code of conduct and the expectations of behavior. An awareness of the aspirational values for College and Career Readiness is shared throughout the school by teachers, students and parents. Students are highly encouraged to achieve mastery in subject classes by achieving scores above 75% and 80% on the English Language Arts and Math regents examinations, respectively. Town hall meetings are held throughout the year addressing various academic and social-emotional issues affecting student learning. The school utilizes a uniform code so students understanding from that they must dress appropriately. Rigorous programs such as College Now, which offer college level classes to our students and the ACE (Architecture, Construction, and Engineering) Program which provides internships and mentoring for students in all grade levels. The ACE Program also provides students with connections to major companies and corporations that focus on architecture, engineering and construction industries.

**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	Charles Gallo	1
2. Assistant Principal	Maurice Borenstein	4
3. Former Principal <sup>4</sup>	Eugene Foley	7
4. Dean of Students	Nestor Payne	4
5. Director of Operations	Dania Valdez-Castro	7

Board of Trustees (School Year 2014-2015)		
Board Member Name	Position – Committee(s)	Was all Documentation Submitted to OSDCP? Was Board Member Approved by OSDCP?
1. Carlo Schiattarella	<b>President</b> <i>Executive, Academic, Facilities</i>	Yes
2. Irma Zardoya	<b>Vice President</b> <i>Executive, Academic</i>	Yes
3. Maria Ramirez	<b>Secretary</b> <i>Executive, Grievance, Budget, Family</i>	Yes
4. Andrew McLaughlin	<b>Member</b> <i>Facilities</i>	Yes
5. Robert Burton	<b>Member</b> <i>Grievance, Academics, Family, Facilities</i>	Yes
6. Alberto Villaman	<b>Treasurer</b> <i>Executive, Grievance, Budget, Facilities</i>	Yes
7. Caren Goff	<b>Member</b>	Yes
8. Patricia Martin	<b>Member</b> <i>Family Engagement</i>	Yes

<sup>4</sup> Eugene Foley resigned as Principal of the school effective February 1, 2015.

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. Academic Committee	Yes	Yes
2. Finance Committee	Yes	No
3. Facilities Committee	Yes	Yes
4. Executive Committee	Yes	Yes

### School Climate & Community Engagement

NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)	
Instructional Staff Turnover (School Year 2013-2014)*	38.7%
Instructional Staff Turnover (School Year 2014-2015)**	26.5%
Number of Instructional Staff Members Not Returning from the Previous Academic Year*	9
Does the School have a Parent Organization?	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If Yes, how many times did it meet?</li> </ul>	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If Yes, how many parents attended these meetings?</li> </ul>	15
Average Daily Attendance Rate (School Year 2013-2014)***	88.5%

\* 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		NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)		Citywide Average
		2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students*	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.**	63%	65%	62%
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	62%	60%	60%
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	87%	87%	79%
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	95%	94%	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.	97%	97%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	84%	70%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	93%	100%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	100%	100%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.***	74%	79%	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*	NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)	95%	93%
	NYC	83%	83%
Parents	NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)	52%	70%
	NYC	54%	53%
Teachers	NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)	97%	100%
	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
<b>Cash Position</b>	Number of days of operating expenses the school can cover without an infusion of cash	60 days (2 months)	190 days	Strong
<b>Liabilities</b>	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	Strong
<b>Projected Revenues</b>	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)	1.02	Strong
<b>Debt Management</b>	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
<b>Total Margin</b>	Did the school operate at a surplus or deficit during the previous fiscal years?	Value should be greater than 0.00	0.40	Strong
	Did the school operate at a surplus or deficit during the past three fiscal years?	Value should be greater than 0.00	0.47	Strong
<b>Ratios</b>	Debt to Asset Ratio	Ratio should be less than 1.00	0.17	Strong
	Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Ratio should be greater than 1.00	0.00	Weak
<b>Cash Flow</b>	Most recent fiscal year's cash flow	Value should be greater than 0.00	\$1,152,972	Strong
	Trend of cash flow over the past three fiscal years	Value should be greater than 0.00	\$1,587,517	Strong

An independent audit performed for fiscal year 2014 (FY14) showed one significant deficiency:

- The approved enrollment is 415 students. The total enrollment as of June 2014 was 441.717, which is 26.717 over the approved enrollment.

**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	7
Number of Board Members Required per the Bylaws	5-9
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	1
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**	8 / 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 <sup>5</sup>	Yes
Employee Fingerprinting	Yes
Safety Plan/Emergency Drill	Yes
Immunization Record <sup>6</sup>	Yes
Insurance	Yes
Lottery	Yes
Annual Report Submitted to SED (2013-2014)	Yes
Financial Audit Posted (2013-2014)	Yes

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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:
32	5	15.6%	27	84.4%	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	Yes
Procedures for expelling students	Yes	Yes
Notice and opportunities to be heard for Short Term Removals (10 days or fewer)	Yes	Yes
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	Yes	Yes
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: 0 (0%) Out of School Suspensions: 31 (7%)	

## Enrollment and Retention Targets<sup>7</sup>

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.

<sup>7</sup> 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, NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI) 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 higher 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, NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI) 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) <sup>8</sup>	<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>97.6%</b>	<b>97.1%</b>
	Effective Target	90.5%	90.4%
	Difference from Effective Target	+7.1	+6.7
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>22.2%</b>
	Effective Target	15.5%	15.5%
	Difference from Effective Target	+0.9	+6.7
English Language Learners (ELL)	<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>21.7%</b>	<b>23.4%</b>
	Effective Target	16.5%	16.5%
	Difference from Effective Target	+5.2	+6.9

<sup>8</sup> The school used a private vendor for lunch services for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years. As a result, the percentage of students receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch in the above table may not accurately capture all students who were eligible for the program. Please note that the above figures are based on the NYSED methodology as of April 1, 2015 for calculating enrollment of special populations and utilize the NYC DOE’s Automate the Schools (ATS) records.

### Retention of Special Populations

Special Population		2013-2014	2014-2015
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>84.5%</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	Effective Target	81.2%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+3.3	-
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>90.7%</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	Effective Target	73.8%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+16.9	-
English Language Learners (ELL)	<b>NYC Charter High School for Architecture, Engineering and Construction Industries (AECI)</b>	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	Effective Target	76.1%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+6.7	-

Enrollment Information Used to Generate Targets		
	2013-2014	2014-2015
Grades Served	9-12	9-12
Enrollment	456	441
CSD(s)	7	7

**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:

- The school shares space with Sts. Peter and Paul Elementary School in the privately-owned building in which it is located. The school has faced challenges with regards to the space sharing arrangement with Sts. Peter and Paul Elementary School and is looking to address those issues through the work of the Facilities Committee.