



Brooklyn Dreams Charter School

2016-17 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 15, 2017

By Brooklyn Dreams Charter School

Board of Trustees

259 Parkville

Brooklyn, NY 11230

718-859-8400

INTRODUCTION

National Heritage Academies prepared this 2016-17 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Richard Conti	President
Joanne Oplustil	Vice President, Finance Committee
Michael Leit	Treasurer, Audit/Compliance Committee, Finance Committee
Michele Morais-Weekes	Secretary, Education Committee, Audit/Compliance Committee
Katherine O'Neill	Trustee, Education Committee
Michele Scotto	Trustee, Audit/Compliance Committee
Tamara Charles	Trustee, Education Committee, Finance Committee

Omar Thomas has served as the principal since May 2016.

INTRODUCTION

Since Brooklyn Dreams Charter School (Brooklyn Dreams) opened in fall 2010, we have not wavered from our original mission:

“To offer the families of Brooklyn a school with a culture that values integrity, academic excellence, and accountability, where all students are given the opportunity for success in high school, college, and beyond by offering an academically rigorous and challenging K-8 educational program.”

We started in 2010 by serving 196 students in grades K-3, and we have added one grade level each year. In the 2016-17 school year, we served 645 students in grades K-8, of whom 84 percent qualified for free or reduced price lunch.

From the beginning, we have consistently and faithfully adhered to the key design elements of our educational program, which are outlined below.

- **Character Development.** We continue to believe that great schools develop both a student’s heart and mind. Our character program is designed to support parents' efforts to teach strong character at home by reinforcing and modeling traditional human virtues, such as compassion and respect. A different virtue is featured each month of the school year and is supported by the classroom curriculum. Daily assemblies are held to discuss the virtues and recognize students and staff who demonstrate these qualities in the school. Additionally, teachers model behavior that exemplifies each virtue and recognize and praise students when they do the same. The ultimate goal of focusing on character is to create a school environment that is both physically and emotionally safe. We know that if students are comfortable in their school, the potential for learning is far greater.
- **Academic Excellence.** We work intentionally to create a culture of academic excellence by providing students with a rigorous and challenging learning environment. We strive to provide each student with a program of study characterized by excellent instruction, as well as a strong, balanced curriculum aligned with New York State’s learning standards. It continues to be our desire to create a school where each student is challenged to achieve—regardless of the student’s skill level. By providing an academically rigorous program, including a robust summer learning program¹, we believe that students will have the opportunity to achieve academic excellence and acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to thrive in high school, college, and beyond.
- **Accountability.** At Brooklyn Dreams, staff, students, and parents are accountable for both their actions and results.
 - *Staff* – Multiple data points are collected and analyzed to monitor the quality of the educational program at the school level, grade level, classroom level, and student level. Using data to drive instruction, we are able to hold teachers accountable for student learning results.
 - *Students* – We encourage our students to take an active role in their education and hold themselves to a higher standard. Students are taught to act responsibly and take accountability for both their positive and negative actions. Importantly, students know and understand their learning goals and are invested in the learning process.
 - *Parents* – We encourage parents and families to be involved in their child’s education because

¹ Summer learning programs are provided for academically at-risk students based on available grant funds.

INTRODUCTION

we recognize that parental involvement is a key indicator of student success. We work purposely to involve parents in the school and in their child's education because it is crucial to maintaining the school culture we desire.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2012-13	75	73	77	73	52	53	-	-	-	403
2013-14	66	78	79	78	74	51	51	-	-	479
2014-15	80	77	79	74	78	74	52	46	-	564
2015-16	69	79	77	78	79	74	79	54	57	648
2016-17	64	71	78	76	80	75	74	79	48	645

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students will be proficient in English Language Arts:

BACKGROUND

We know that our curriculum must prepare students for a rigorous high school curriculum to provide them with the best opportunity for college success. We implement a curricular program, including a robust system of assessment, which is built around the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and aligns with our mission.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts (“ELA”) assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in April 2017. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year’s test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year).

2016-17 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ²				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	74	14	8	4	0	78
4	71	9	3	2	0	76
5	72	12	2	5	0	77
6	66	9	1	2	0	68
7	72	10	4	4	0	76
8	47	6	3	0	0	47
All	402	60	21	17	0	422

² Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

RESULTS

In 2016-17, 46 percent of students enrolled in at least their second year achieved a level 3 or higher on New York State ELA exam.

Performance on 2016-17 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	60.8%	74	63.5%	63
4	47.9%	71	45.6%	57
5	41.7%	72	47.5%	59
6	22.7%	66	26.3%	57
7	37.5%	72	39.0%	64
8	53.2%	47	54.5%	44
All	43.8%	402	45.9%	344

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams did not meet this measure in 2016-17.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

In 2016-17, Brooklyn Dreams increased the percentage of students scoring proficient on the New York ELA exam by 9 percentage points from the prior year. This was after increasing the percentage of proficient students by 10 percentage points in 2015-16, making for a 19 percentage point gain over a two year period.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	31.3%	67	36.9%	65	63.5%	63
4	28.6%	70	51.5%	66	45.6%	57
5	18.5%	65	31.1%	61	47.5%	59
6	35.7%	42	31.8%	66	26.3%	57
7	17.5%	40	30.0%	50	39.0%	64
8	--	--	34.8%	46	54.5%	44
All	26.4%	284	36.4%	354	45.9%	344

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index ("PLI") on the State English language arts exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective ("AMO") set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

METHOD

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 English language arts AMO of 111. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.³

RESULTS

Brooklyn Dreams met the 2016-17 ELA goal, with a PLI score of 128, which is 17 points higher than the threshold.

English Language Arts 2016-17 Performance Level Index

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	17.7	36.3	34.3	11.6

$$\begin{array}{rclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 36.3 & + & 34.3 & + & 11.6 & = & 82.2 \\
 & & & & 34.3 & + & 11.6 & = & \underline{45.9} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 128.1
 \end{array}$$

³ In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams has met the PLI target in both 2015-16 and 2016-17.

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

METHOD

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.⁴

RESULTS

Brooklyn Dreams met this goal. In 2016-17, 46 percent of Brooklyn Dreams students scored at or above level 3 on the New York State ELA exam compared to 45 percent of district students.

2016-17 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	63.5%	63	46.6%	2644
4	45.6%	57	47.1%	2839
5	47.5%	59	40.7%	2668
6	26.3%	57	34.1%	2083
7	39.0%	64	46.9%	2055
8	54.5%	44	51.2%	2075
All	45.9%	344	44.5%	14364

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams met this goal in 2016-17, with 1.4 percent more students meeting the proficiency target than the local district. Proficiency rates were higher than the local district in 3 out of the 6 grades tested (grades 3, 5 and 8).

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

After making large gains in ELA proficiency over the last two years, 2016-17 is the first year that Brooklyn Dreams has outperformed the local district. Brooklyn Dreams also serves a more

⁴ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

disadvantaged population than the local district, with 80 percent of students qualifying for Free or reduced-price lunch compared to 66 percent of students at the local district.

English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Scoring at or Above Proficiency Compared to District Students					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	31.3%	35%	36.9%	46%	63.5%	46.6%
4	28.6%	36%	51.5%	49%	45.6%	47.1%
5	18.5%	33%	31.1%	41%	47.5%	40.7%
6	35.7%	35%	31.8%	38%	26.3%	34.1%
7	17.5%	33%	30.0%	39%	39.0%	46.9%
8	--	--	34.8%	47%	54.5%	51.2%
All	26.4%	35%	36.4%	43%	45.9%	44.5%

A more precise comparison of proficiency. Due to the discrepancy in FRL percentages between Brooklyn Dreams and CSD #22, we divided the district into two parts to conduct an instructive comparison of the performance between Dreams and the local district. Avenue M and Avenue N separated the district into two approximately equal halves. We found a significant difference in the scores of schools in the northern half (where Brooklyn Dreams is located) compared to schools in the southern half, with southern schools having higher academic scores and lower free or reduced-price lunch percentages. Although Brooklyn Dreams' FRL percentage (80.2 percent) is higher than the district schools in the northern half, these schools were, on average, more similar demographically to Brooklyn Dreams and likely a better comparison group.

English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District					
	Brooklyn Dreams (80% FRL)	Northern Schools (73% FRL)	+/-	Southern Schools (61% FRL)	+/-
2015-16	36.4%	35.5%	0.9%	52.5%	-16.1%
2016-17	44.5%	36.8%	7.7%	52.6%	-8.1%

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

METHOD

The SUNY Charter Schools Institute (“Institute”) conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

In 2015-16, Brooklyn Dreams met this goal with an effect size of 0.52, which was higher than expected to a meaningful degree.

2015-16 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	82.5	72	38	31.4	6.6	0.36
4	82.1	74	51	29.8	21.2	1.18
5	74.1	75	28	26.3	1.8	0.12
6	84.0	75	32	22.7	9.3	0.59
7	87.3	54	28	20.6	7.4	0.47
8	80.4	53	36	29.8	6.2	0.35
All	81.5	403	35.8	26.9	8.9	0.52

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to a meaningful degree

EVALUATION

In 2015-16, Brooklyn Dreams met this goal with an effect size of 0.52. Fourth grade had the highest effect size at 1.18, and all grades had a positive effect size.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

In 2015-16 and 2014-15, Brooklyn Dreams an effect size that was higher than expected to a meaningful degree.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2013-14	3-6	89.4	254	17.6	18.6	-0.08
2014-15	3-7	82.4	329	25.0	19.5	0.44
2015-16	3-8	81.5	403	35.8	26.9	0.52

Additionally, we also evaluated Brooklyn Dreams' performance using a regression analysis based on average scaled scores. Average scaled scores help capture differences between students that are just below the proficiency line, and students that are far below proficient. This metric has a direct correlation to the percentage of questions that were answered correctly on the state test.

The charts below compare the proficiency regression analysis that is run by CSI for all schools with a scaled score regression analysis. This analysis uses student scaled scores to reveal a greater degree of positive movement, which would meet the CSI definition as higher than expected to a large degree.

	ELA Scaled Score Regression		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
CSI Proficiency Regression	-0.08	0.44	0.52
Scaled Score Regression	0.56	0.78	0.81

Goal 1: Growth Measure⁵

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2015-16 and also have a state exam score from 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 score are ranked by their 2015-16 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a

⁵ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁶

RESULTS

In 2015-16, Brooklyn Dreams had a Mean Growth Percentile (MGP) that was above the state average, with a score of 56.5.

2015-16 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4	59.5	50.0
5	58	50.0
6	58.5	50.0
7	53.5	50.0
8	52.5	50.0
All	56.5	50.0

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams met this goal in the aggregate and at every grade level in the school. This shows that the above average gains made by the school were not concentrated in a few areas, but were widespread across all student groups.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Brooklyn Dreams has seen accelerating growth, with growth rates at the school increasing over the last 3 years.

English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			Statewide Median
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	
4	43.5	44	59.5	50.0
5	44	41.5	58	50.0
6	48.5	60	58.5	50.0
7	--	64	53.5	50.0
8	--	--	52.5	50.0
All	45	50	56.5	50.0

⁶ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

Goal 1: Optional Measure

Each year, the school will administer a nationally-normed standardized assessment in grades K-8. In the spring of each year, the majority of grades and subject comparison categories (e.g. grade 2 reading is one category, grade 3 reading is another category, etc.) will score at or above the 50th percentile of public schools nationally as measured by beginning to end-of-year growth in grades 2-8.

METHOD:

This measure examines the growth in student knowledge as measured from the beginning to the end of year, as measured by the NWEA MAP test. Student growth is compared to the national norm for students across the country.

RESULTS:

	NWEA Fall-Spring Growth Percentile	
	Math	Reading
2	4	18
3	15	11
4	9	3
5	33	12
6	20	4
7	39	35
8	15	37

EVALUATION:

In 2016-17, growth scores for Brooklyn Dreams on NWEA did not meet the 50th percentile.

Goal 1: Optional Measure

Each year, the school will administer a nationally-normed standardized assessment in grades K-8. The median percentile for students enrolled for 3+ years will be = 50 on the spring test.

METHOD:

This measure examines the performance of students enrolled for 3+ years, as measured by the NWEA MAP test. Student growth is compared to the national norm for students across the country. The RIT score of the median student at Brooklyn Dreams was compared to the national norm, and evaluated for the percentile of the median performance.

RESULTS:

	NWEA Median Percentile for 3+ Year Students	
	Math	Reading
2	53	62
3	52	58
4	42	52
5	56	56
6	51	51
7	51	65
8	60	65
Overall	52	58

EVALUATION:

Brooklyn Dreams met this goal. The median percentile for students enrolled for 3+ years is 52 for math, and 58 for reading. Additionally, all grade levels except 4th grade math had median RIT percentiles over the 50th percentile.

SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Brooklyn Dreams met five of the seven ELA goals listed below. The absolute 75 percent proficiency goal remains to be more of an aspirational goal for us, considering that only 40 percent of students statewide were proficient in ELA. Brooklyn Dreams has made progress on this goal, increasing the percentage of students proficient by 19 percentage points over the last two years.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	Not Met
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the	Met

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

	state English language arts exam will meet that year’s Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Met
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2015-16 results.)	Met
Growth	Each year, under the state’s Growth Model the school’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile. (Using 2015-16 results.)	Met
Comparative	Each year, the school will administer a nationally-normed standardized assessment in grades K-8. The median percentile for students enrolled for 3+ years will be = 50 on the spring test.	Met
Growth	Each year, the school will administer a nationally-normed standardized assessment in grades K-8. In the spring of each year, the majority of grades and subject comparison categories (e.g. grade 2 reading is one category, grade 3 reading is another category, etc.) will score at or above the 50th percentile of public schools nationally as measured by beginning to end-of-year growth in grades 2-8.	Not Met

ACTION PLAN

Based on our analysis of performance against charter goals and other available data, we are implementing the following improvements to our educational program:

- **Focus on data analysis and the New York State learning standards.** We designed and implemented a modified professional development calendar. Several times a quarter, deans conduct data dives with grade-level teachers to understand how to effectively analyze data and deconstruct the state standards to drive more effective instruction. In addition, data is discussed during weekly staff meetings.
- **Provide professional development on the effective use of curricular tools.** NHA’s senior curriculum specialist conducted 10 two- to three-day sessions throughout the year with teachers to provide guidance on the effective use of the curricular tools. During classroom observations and lesson plan reviews, deans assess whether these tools are being used with fidelity. Again, feedback and additional coaching are provided during one-on-one meetings.
- **Utilize a new progress monitoring tool.** In 2016-17, we began using *aimswebPlus* to help monitor students’ progress. Reports from *aimswebPlus* provide leaders and teachers helpful data to determine if students are meeting their individual learning goals. Teachers use this data to adjust instruction and create groups for small-group instruction.

- **Develop consistent instructional effectiveness in all classrooms.** In partnership with NHA, we developed and employed a new rubric – the classroom framework – to monitor the quality of classroom instruction. This framework aligns with four essential instructional competencies that create and sustain high-quality instruction: *classroom culture*, *planning*, *teaching*, and *assessing*. These four competencies are interconnected in what we refer to as the cycle of teaching – with *classroom culture* as the first priority. Deans use the classroom framework to assess the quality of instruction in every classroom and to coach and mentor teachers to improve teaching and learning.
 - In support of the framework, the leadership team introduced *instructional rounds*. During this time, the leadership team conducts 15-minute classroom observations and debriefs after each observation on the teacher’s strengths and next steps for improvement. These observations are in addition to the regular teacher observations that each dean conducts. During one-on-one meetings, the dean provides feedback and coaching to the teacher.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

All students will be proficient in math.

BACKGROUND

We know that our curriculum must prepare students for a rigorous high school curriculum to provide them with the best opportunity for college success. We implement a curricular program, including a robust system of assessment, which is built around the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and aligns with our mission.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics examination for grades 3-8.

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in third through eighth grades in April 2017. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year’s test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year.

2016-17 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁷				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	14	8	4	0	77	14
4	8	2	7	1	74	8
5	12	2	6	0	77	12
6	9	2	1	0	67	9
7	10	4	4	0	74	10
8	6	3	0	0	47	6
All	59	21	22	1	416	59

RESULTS

In 2016-17, 48 percent of students enrolled in at least their second year achieved a level 3 or higher on the state test on the New York State Math exam.

⁷ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Performance on 2016-17 State Mathematics Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	67.1%	73	69.8%	63
4	47.0%	66	50.0%	52
5	49.3%	71	54.4%	57
6	42.4%	66	50.0%	56
7	27.1%	70	30.1%	63
8	27.7%	47	27.3%	44
All	44.5%	393	47.7%	335

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams did not meet this measure in 2016-17.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

In 2016-17, Brooklyn Dreams increased the percentage of students scoring proficient on the New York Math exam by 10 percentage points from 2015-16.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	59.7%	67	47.7%	65	69.8%	63
4	41.4%	70	50.0%	66	50.0%	52
5	33.8%	65	41.0%	61	54.4%	57
6	38.1%	42	36.4%	66	50.0%	56
7	17.5%	40	20.4%	49	30.1%	63
8	--	--	25.0%	48	27.3%	44
All	40.1%	284	38.0%	355	47.7%	335

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index ("PLI") on the State mathematics exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective ("AMO") set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

METHOD

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state’s learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 mathematics AMO of **109**. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.⁸

RESULTS

Brooklyn Dreams met the 2016-17 Math goal with a PLI of 127, which is 18 points higher than the goal of 109.

Mathematics 2016-17 Performance Level Index (PLI)									
Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level								
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4					
	20.9	31.3	25.7	22.1					
	PI	=	31.3	+	25.7	+	22.1	=	79.1
					25.7	+	22.1	=	<u>47.8</u>
							PLI	=	126.9

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams has met the PLI target for math in both 2015-16 and 2016-17.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.⁹

⁸ In contrast to NYSED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

⁹ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

RESULTS

Brooklyn Dreams met this goal. In 2016-17 48 percent of Brooklyn Dreams students scored at or above level 3 on the New York State math exam compared to 43 percent of district students.

2016-17 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	69.8%	63	51.8%	2718
4	50.0%	52	47.9%	2882
5	54.4%	57	47.5%	2703
6	50.0%	56	37.2%	2125
7	30.1%	63	37.2%	2049
8	27.3%	44	32.1%	2019
All	47.7%	335	43.3%	14496

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams met this goal in 2016-17, with 4.4 percent more students meeting the proficiency target than the local district. Proficiency rates were higher than the local district in four of the six grades tested (grades 3, 4, 5, and 6).

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

After making large gains in math proficiency, we are pleased as 2016-17 is the first year that Brooklyn Dreams has outperformed the local district. Brooklyn Dreams also serves a more disadvantaged population than the local district, with 80 percent of students qualifying for Free or reduced-price lunch compared to 66 percent of students at the local district.

Mathematics Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	59.7%	44%	47.7%	46%	69.8%	51.8%

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

4	41.4%	43%	50.0%	45%	50.0%	47.9%
5	33.8%	46%	41.0%	42%	54.4%	47.5%
6	38.1%	37%	36.4%	38%	50.0%	37.2%
7	17.5%	35%	20.4%	37%	30.1%	37.2%
8	--	-	25.0%	34%	27.3%	32.1%
All	40.1%	41%	38.0%	40%	47.7%	43.3%

A more precise comparison of proficiency. Due to the discrepancy in FRL percentages between Brooklyn Dreams and CSD #22, we divided the district into two parts to conduct an instructive comparison of the performance between Dreams and the local district. Avenue M and Avenue N separated the district into two approximately equal halves. We found a significant difference in the scores of schools in the northern half (where Brooklyn Dreams is located) compared to schools in the southern half, with southern schools having higher academic scores and lower free or reduced-price lunch percentages. Although Brooklyn Dreams' FRL percentage (80%) is higher than the district schools in the northern half, these schools were, on average, more similar demographically to Brooklyn Dreams and likely a better comparison group.

Math Performance of Charter School and Local District					
	Brooklyn Dreams (80% FRL)	Northern Schools (73% FRL)	+/-	Southern Schools (61% FRL)	+/-
2015-16	37.2%	30.0%	7.2%	53.7%	-16.5%
2016-17	47.7%	34.4%	13.3%	52.8%	-5.1%

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

METHOD

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the requirement for achieving this measure.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

In 2015-16, Brooklyn Dreams met this goal with an effect size of 0.52, which was higher than expected to a meaningful degree.

2015-16 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	82.5	72	53	33.9	19.1	0.89
4	82.1	74	46	32.7	13.3	0.66
5	74.1	74	38	31.4	6.6	0.37
6	84.0	75	36	25.0	11.0	0.53
7	87.3	53	19	17.1	1.9	0.10
8	80.4	55	24	15.8	8.2	0.43
All	81.5	403	37.4	26.9	10.5	0.52

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to a meaningful degree

EVALUATION

In 2015-16, Brooklyn Dreams met this goal with an effect size of 0.52. Third grade had the highest effect size at 0.89, and all grades had a positive effect size.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

For the last 3 years, Brooklyn Dreams has had an effect size that was higher than expected to a meaningful degree.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
-------------	--------	---	---------------	--------	-----------	-------------

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

		Disadvantaged				
2013-14	3-6	89.4	255	38.0	26.5	0.63
2014-15	3-7	82.4	329	40.9	27.2	0.74
2015-16	3-8	81.5	403	37.4	26.9	0.52

Additionally we also evaluated Brooklyn Dreams' performance using a regression analysis based on average scaled scores. Average scaled scores help capture differences between students that are just below the proficiency line, and students that are far below proficient. This metric has a direct correlation to the percentage of questions that were answered correctly on the state test.

The charts below compare the proficiency regression analysis that is run by CSI for all schools with a scaled score regression analysis. This analysis uses student scaled scores to reveal a greater degree of positive movement, which would meet the CSI definition as higher than expected to a large degree.

	Math Scaled Score Regression				
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
CSI Proficiency Regression	0.13	1.03	0.63	0.74	0.52
Scaled Score Regression	0.26	1.18	0.8	1.14	0.91

Goal 2: Growth Measure¹⁰

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2015-16 and also have a state exam score in 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 scores are ranked by their 2015-16 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

¹⁰ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.¹¹

RESULTS

In 2015-16, Brooklyn Dreams had a Mean Growth Percentile (MGP) of 49, which is just below the state average of 50.

2015-16 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4	50	50.0
5	47.5	50.0
6	54	50.0
7	38	50.0
8	55	50.0
All	49	50.0

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams was below this goal by one point and did not meet the goal. Three of five grade levels had growth above the state average.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Growth for Brooklyn Dreams was mean average for 2014-15 and 2015-16, with growth rates of 50 and 49 respectively.

¹¹ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			Statewide Median
	2013-14	2015-16	2015-16	
4	24	48.5	50	50.0
5	46	47	47.5	50.0
6	66	58	54	50.0
7	-	49	38	50.0
8	-	-	55	50.0
All	42	50	49	50.0

Goal 1: Optional Measure

Each year, the school will administer a nationally-normed standardized assessment in grades K-8. The median percentile for students enrolled for 3+ years will be = 50 on the spring test.

METHOD:

This measure examines the performance of students enrolled for 3+ years, as measured by the NWEA MAP test. Student growth is compared to the national norm for students across the country. The RIT score of the median student at Brooklyn Dreams was compared to the national norm, and evaluated for the percentile of the median performance.

RESULTS:

	NWEA Median Percentile for 3+ Year Students	
	Math	Reading
2	53	62
3	52	58
4	42	52
5	56	56
6	51	51
7	51	65
8	60	65
Overall	52	58

EVALUATION:

Brooklyn Dreams met this goal. The median percentile for students enrolled for 3+ years is 52 for math, and 58 for reading. Additionally all grade levels except 4th grade math and median RIT percentiles over the 50th percentile.

Goal 2: Optional Measure

Each year, the school will administer a nationally-normed standardized assessment in grades K-8. In the spring of each year, the majority of grades and subject comparison categories (e.g. grade 2 math is one category, grade 3 math is another category, etc.) will score at or above the 50th percentile of public schools nationally as measured by beginning to end-of-year growth in grades 2-8.

METHOD:

This measure examines the growth in student knowledge as measured from the beginning to the end of year, as measured by the NWEA MAP test. Student growth is compared to the national norm for students across the country.

RESULTS:

	NWEA Fall-Spring Growth Percentile	
	Math	Reading
2	4	18
3	15	11
4	9	3
5	33	12
6	20	4
7	39	35
8	15	37

EVALUATION:

In 2016-17, growth scores for Brooklyn Dreams on NWEA did not meet the 50th percentile.

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

Brooklyn Dreams met four of the seven ELA goals listed below. The growth goal, the school missed by only one point, with a score of 49. The absolute 75 percent proficiency goal remains to be more of an aspirational goal for us, considering that only 40 percent of students statewide were proficient in Math. Brooklyn Dreams has made progress on this goal, increasing the percentage of students proficient by 10 percentage points over last year.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam for grades 3-8.	Not Met
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year’s Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	Met
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Met
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2015-16 school district results.)	Met
Growth	Each year, under the state’s Growth Model the school’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile.	Not Met
Comparative	Each year, the school will administer a nationally-normed standardized assessment in grades K-8. The median percentile for students enrolled for 3+ years will be = 50 on the spring test.	Met
Growth	Each year, the school will administer a nationally-normed standardized assessment in grades K-8. In the spring of each year, the majority of grades and subject comparison categories (e.g. grade 2 math is one category, grade 3 math is another category, etc.) will score at or above the 50th percentile of public schools nationally as measured by beginning to end-of-year growth in grades 2-8.	Not Met

ACTION PLAN

Based on our analysis of performance against charter goals and other available data, we are implementing the following improvements to our educational program:

- **Focus on data analysis and the New York State learning standards.** We designed and implemented a modified professional development calendar. Several times a quarter, deans conduct data dives with grade-level teachers to understand how to effectively analyze data and

deconstruct the state standards to drive more effective instruction. In addition, data is discussed during weekly staff meetings.

- **Provide professional development on the effective use of curricular tools.** NHA’s senior curriculum specialist conducted 10 two- to three-day sessions throughout the year with teachers to provide guidance on the effective use of the curricular tools. During classroom observations and lesson plan reviews, deans assess whether these tools are being used with fidelity. Again, feedback and additional coaching are provided during one-on-one meetings.
- **Utilize a new progress monitoring tool.** In 2016-17, we began using *aimswebPlus* to help monitor students’ progress. Reports from *aimswebPlus* provide leaders and teachers helpful data to determine if students are meeting their individual learning goals. Teachers use this data to adjust instruction and create groups for small-group instruction.
- **Develop consistent instructional effectiveness in all classrooms.** In partnership with NHA, we developed and employed a new rubric – the classroom framework – to monitor the quality of classroom instruction. This framework aligns with four essential instructional competencies that create and sustain high-quality instruction: *classroom culture, planning, teaching, and assessing*. These four competencies are interconnected in what we refer to as the cycle of teaching – with *classroom culture* as the first priority. Deans use the classroom framework to assess the quality of instruction in every classroom and to coach and mentor teachers to improve teaching and learning.
 - In support of the framework, the leadership team introduced *instructional rounds*. During this time, the leadership team conducts 15-minute classroom observations and debriefs after each observation on the teacher’s strengths and next steps for improvement. These observations are in addition to the regular teacher observations that each dean conducts. During one-on-one meetings, the dean provides feedback and coaching to the teacher.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Students will be proficient in Science.

BACKGROUND

We know that our curriculum must prepare students for a rigorous high school curriculum to provide them with the best opportunity for college success. As such, we implement a rigorous curricular program, including a robust system of assessment, which is built around the New York State Learning Standards (NYSLs) for science and aligns with our mission. Staff is provided with professional development to support the implementation of the school’s science curriculum.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State science examination.

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grades in spring 2017. The school converted each student’s raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year to score at proficiency.

RESULTS

In 2016-17, 69 percent of students enrolled in at least their second year achieved a level 3 or higher on the New York state Science exam.

Charter School Performance on 2016-17 State Science Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	84.6%	52	81.8%	66
8	50.0%	42	50.0%	44
All	69.1%	94	69.0%	110

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams did not meet this measure, falling 6 percentage points shy of the 75 percent goal.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

In 2016-17, Brooklyn Dreams increased the percentage of students scoring proficient on the New York Science exam by 5 percentage points from 2015-16.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	81.4%	70	81.0%	63	84.6%	52
8	-	-	38.1%	42	50.0%	42
All	81.4%	70	63.8%	105	69.1%	94

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state science exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

METHOD

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the school district of comparison.

RESULTS

Science results for 2016-17 cannot be compared to the local district as science scores have not been released publicly.

2016-17 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	84.6%	52		
8	50.0%	42		
All	69.1%	94		

EVALUATION

The goal cannot be evaluated at this time.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Brooklyn Dreams did not meet this goal in 2015-16 or 2014-15. It should be noted that Brooklyn Dreams serves a more disadvantaged population than the local district, with 80 percent of students qualifying for free-or-reduced-price lunch compared to 66 percent of students at the local district.

Science Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
4	81.4%	85%	81.0%	90%	84.6%	
8	-	-	38.1%	64%	50.0%	
All	81.4%	85%	63.8%	77%	69.1%	

SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

The comparative goal cannot be evaluated for 2016-17, as results for the local district have not been released publicly. The school did not meet the absolute measure.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Not Met
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	TBD

ACTION PLAN

We have taken steps to strengthen our middle school science program and increase student attainment.

- In 2016-17, we added a middle school science lab teacher.
- In 2017-18, we will have a dedicated science teacher for grades 7-8.
- We also plan to implement STEM Scopes, a new science curricular tool for grades 6-8 that better aligns to state standards. This step will help prepare students for the NYSTP when they reach grade 8.

NCLB

Goal 4: NCLB

See absolute measure.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as school requiring a local assistance plan.

METHOD

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's learning standards, the federal No Child Left Behind legislation stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet state proficiency standards. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards. The report cards indicate each school’s status under the state’s No Child Left Behind (“NCLB”) accountability system.

RESULTS

The school is in good standing.

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams met this goal as the school is in good standing.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2014-15	Good Standing
2015-16	Good Standing
2016-17	Good Standing

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

The following section contains a Parent Satisfaction optional goal, as well as examples of possible optional measures.

Goal 5:

The school will be organizationally viable and financially sound.

Goal 5: Measure 1

Each year, the school will average a student attendance rate at or above 93%.

METHOD

The student attendance rate is determined using the school’s Average Daily Attendance during the 2016-17 school year.

RESULTS

For 2016-17, the student attendance rate for Brooklyn Dreams Charter School was 93.3 percent.

2016-17 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
K	91.3%
1	90.5%
2	90.9%
3	92.5%
4	91.4%
5	93.6%
6	97.4%
7	98.4%
8	95.3%
Overall	93.3

EVALUATION

With an attendance rate of 93.3 percent, Brooklyn Dreams Charter School met the stated measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2014-15	94.2%
2015-16	94.5%
2016-17	93.3%

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY TABLES

Goal 5: Measure 2

Each year, the school will receive an unqualified audit from an independent certified public accounting firm hired by the Board of Trustees.

METHOD

Brooklyn Dreams Charter School will retain an independent certified accounting firm to review the school's financial transactions during the 2016-17 school year.

RESULTS

Brooklyn Dreams has contracted with an independent certified public accounting firm to complete an audit of the 2016-17 school year. This audit is in process and will be submitted to CSI on or before November 1, 2017.

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams has contracted with an independent certified public accounting firm to complete an audit of the 2016-17 school year. This audit is in process and will be submitted to CSI on or before November 1, 2017.

Goal 5: Measure 3

Each year, the school's Board of Trustees will assess the performance of its education management partner. The review will be used to identify the management partner's successes and opportunities to improve its future performance, as well as ensure the Board and management partner's relationship is effectively serving the school.

METHOD

The Brooklyn Dreams Charter School Board of Trustees will assess the performance of its education management partner.

RESULTS

The Board of Trustees completed an evaluation of NHA during the 2016-17 school year.

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams Charter School met this measure by assessing the performance of its education management partner.

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY TABLES

Goal 5: Measure 4

Each year, the school's Board of Trustees will maintain a relationship with independent legal counsel that reviews relevant policies, documents, and incidents and makes recommendations as needed, and in proportion to the legal expertise on the board of trustees, if any.

METHOD

Throughout the school year, the Board of Trustees are presented with a number of issues which require legal review. Policies, documents, and issues are shared with the Board's independent legal counsel for analysis and recommendations.

RESULTS

The Board appointed its legal counsel during its annual meeting. The Board's legal counsel thoroughly reviewed all issues and provided the Board with timely and thoughtful responses to aid in its decision-making.

EVALUATION

The Board successfully met this measure in 2016-17.

Goal 5: Measure 5

Each year, the school will generally and substantially comply with all applicable federal and state laws, rules and regulations, and the provisions of its by-laws, Provisional Charter (certificate of incorporation) and Charter Agreement.

METHOD

In consultation with its legal counsel, Brooklyn Dreams Charter School will be in compliance with all applicable state and federal laws, rules, and regulations.

RESULTS

In consultation with its legal counsel, Brooklyn Dreams Charter School was in full compliance with all applicable state and federal laws, rules, and regulations.

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams met this goal by being compliant with all applicable state and federal laws, rules, and regulations.