

**BROOKLYN DREAMS
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 16, 2011

By the Brooklyn Dreams Charter School Board of Trustees

259 Parkville Avenue

Brooklyn, NY 11230

(718) 859-8400

www.brooklyndreamscharterschool.org

National Heritage Academies prepared this 2010-11 Accountability Progress Report, on behalf of the Brooklyn Dreams Board of Trustees.

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Richard Conti	President
Joanne Oplustil	Vice President Education Committee
Michael Pedone	Treasurer Finance Committee
Sara Doar	Trustee Education Committee
Michael Melendez	Trustee
Christian Nugent	Trustee Finance Committee
Katherine O'Neill	Trustee

INTRODUCTION

The State University of New York’s Board of Trustees (SUNY) authorized Brooklyn Dreams Charter School (Brooklyn Excelsior) in October 2009. The school, located in a refurbished school building at 259 Parkville Avenue in Brooklyn, opened its doors to K-3 students in the fall of 2010.

The school served 193 students in grades K-3 during its first year of operation. In 2011-12, it will expand to serve a capacity of 248 students in grades K-4. As of August 2011, Brooklyn Dreams has nearly 800 students on the waiting list.

The mission of Brooklyn Dreams Charter School is:

*“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.”*

This mission has guided the operation of the school since its inception. We have worked and will continue to work to ensure that our students have the academic knowledge and skills, as well as personal characteristics, necessary for success.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2010-11	39	51	51	52	-	-	-	-	-	193

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students will be proficient in English Language Arts.

Background

Developing reading proficiency and strong literacy skills in elementary and middle school grades is essential to ensuring that students are on a college-readiness trajectory.¹ The ELA curriculum is designed to produce highly literate students who are proficient readers and strong writers. The curriculum enables students to read, comprehend, write, and respond thoughtfully to what they encounter in the classroom and the world around them through its reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing components.

The curriculum emphasizes the five components of reading instruction as outlined by the National Reading Panel. Students who master the ELA curriculum are prepared to read for deep meaning and understanding, write and speak effectively to communicate ideas and information while using appropriate language conventions, listen actively and critically as they encounter new information and ideas, and generate new ideas based on what they encounter both inside and outside the classroom.

Beyond this, the curriculum in grades K-2 focuses on and supports the process of learning to read. Decoding, word recognition, and building vocabulary are important as students begin to develop understanding and fluency. In grades 3-5, the curriculum supports a transition from learning to read to reading in order to learn; learning shifts to understanding that texts have specific purposes and students learn to read with those purposes in mind. Students are introduced to informational text in addition to a variety of literary texts. Reliance on the basal reader decreases and additional resources like novels, newspapers, magazines, and web-based resources are used to support reading instruction. Finally, in grades 6-8, the curriculum focuses on extending reading and comprehension skills, developing deep evaluation and analysis skills and the ability to make connections within and between texts.

The ELA curriculum supports learning in language conventions, mechanics, spelling, and writing. In the earliest grades, students learn how to write words and sentences using appropriate mechanics and grammar and begin to use the writing process to convey information and narrative through written text. In middle grades, the curriculum develops in students a deeper understanding of writing through a focus on prewriting strategies, organizational formats, drafting, revising, proofreading and publishing. The curriculum ensures that students learn to write for different purposes; writing includes narratives, stories, poems, interpretive responses, essays, and descriptive pieces. In later grades, the curriculum continues to extend students' writing skills through narrative, expository, persuasive, and technical writing, and technology enhances students' ability to write, revise, edit, and publish their work. Grammar, punctuation, spelling, and writing conventions are taught as part of language arts for students in all grades.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State English language arts examination.

¹ ACT, Inc., *Reading Between the Lines: What the ACT Reveals About College Readiness in Reading* (Iowa City, IA, 2006).

In 2009-10 and 2010-11, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the state's Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores on the New York State English Language arts examination.²

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in third grade in April 2011. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state's Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	657
4	654
5	654
6	654
7	652
8	652

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 been enrolled for less than one year.

2010-11 State English Language Arts Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ³			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	51	0	0	1	52
All	51	0	0	1	52

Results

Of students at Brooklyn Dreams, the overall percent of students achieving a Scale Score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score is 48%. Since Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, none of these students are in their second year.

² In order to abide by the measures to which schools are held accountable in their school's Accountability Plans, the Institute will continue to use the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, which provide year-to-year consistency with the Plan's standard while accounting for the timing of the test administration (i.e., SED now gives the test later in the school year).

³ 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.

**Charter School Performance on 2010-11 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students	48%	52
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	-	-
All	All Students	48%	52
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	-	-

Evaluation

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, none of its students have been enrolled for two years. We are unable to determine whether the school met this measure.

Additional Evidence

The 2010-11 data will serve as Brooklyn Dreams’ first data point for the New York State English language arts assessment. The Northwest Evaluation Association’s measure of academic progress shows that students at Brooklyn Dreams grew at an accelerated rate during the 2010-11 school year in language usage and reading. Compared to the national average of 100%, students at Brooklyn Dreams grew 127% in language use and 119% in reading.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11.		
Grade	2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested
3	48%	52
All	48%	52

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) 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 all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state’s learning standards in English Language Arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s English language arts AMO.

As SED has not yet determined this year's AMO, Brooklyn Dreams is not able to calculate the Performance Index and has omitted the measure from this Progress Report.

Goal 1: Comparative Measure
 Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

Tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year are compared to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students and the results for the respective grades in the local school district, as well as between the total result of 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.

Results

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met this measure.

**2010-11 State English Language Arts Exam
 Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	-	-	55%	2902
All	-	-	50%	16047

Evaluation

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met this measure.

Additional Evidence

As stated above, the 2010-11 data will serve as Brooklyn Dreams' first data point for the New York State English language arts assessment. The Northwest Evaluation Association's measure of academic progress shows that students at Brooklyn Dreams grew at an accelerated rate during the 2010-11 school year in language usage and reading. Compared to the national average of 100%, students at Brooklyn Dreams grew 127% in language use and 119% in reading.

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

Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students		
Grade	2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District
3	-	55%
All	-	50%

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school’s actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school’s actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010 and, therefore, data from 2009-10 is not available.

Goal 1: Growth Measure

On the current year’s state English language arts exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year’s state English language arts exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

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 towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2010-11 and also have a state exam score in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met this measure.

Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2009-10 to 2010-11

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
All	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Evaluation

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met this measure.

Additional Evidence

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met this measure.

Cohort Performance on State English Language Arts Exam Since the Advent of the Grades 3-8 Testing Program by School Year

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2007-08	Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010 and is therefore unable to compare cohorts from previous years.		
2008-09			
2009-10			
2010-11			

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met its accountability plan measures in English language arts. However, 48% of first year students scored above the time adjusted Level 3 Cut Sores.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	n/a
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	n/a
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	n/a
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	n/a

Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	n/a
--------	--	-----

Action Plan

The school has implemented activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering standards are provided with effective and timely additional assistance. Additionally, the school has developed measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis in order to provide teachers and school leadership with sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.

Teachers will utilize formative assessment to meet the varied learning needs of students. The school will use differentiated instruction by implementing regularly-scheduled workshop sessions and flexible grouping in order to meet each student's individual learning needs. As part of this differentiation, teachers use the formative assessment process to ask and answer these questions: 1) What do we want each student to learn; 2) How will we know what each student has learned; and 3) How will we respond when students have difficulty learning. By answering these questions collaboratively, teachers will ensure that appropriate intervention is delivered to students who are having difficulties mastering challenging state standards.

Beyond this, the school's instructional staff will collaborate with its Interventions Assistance Team (IAT), which works to identify students having academic or behavioral difficulties. Students who are in danger of having difficulty mastering the State's academic achievement standards will first be identified by the individual teacher's assessment process, and then students will be referred to the IAT. The IAT will provide suggested intervention strategies to implement with individual students. Such strategies will include, but are not limited to:

- Adapting time allotted for learning task or completion of assessment
- Adapting the number of items that the learner is expected to complete or learn
- Adapting the goals or outcome expectations while using the same materials
- Adapting the way instruction is given to the learner. For example: visual aids, hands on activities or cooperative groups.

Teachers will log interventions used with the individual students and share the results with the school's IAT team as appropriate.

Additional supplemental interventions are offered for at risk students. Some of these supplemental interventions include:

- Workshop Intervention
- Supplemental personnel, including academic specialists and an instructional coach.
- Extended Learning opportunities, including after-school/Saturday programming and summer learning programming for at-risk students.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

All students will be proficient in English Language Arts.

Background

The National Council for Teachers of Mathematics has recognized the importance of the study of algebra in developing mathematical fluency and has also noted the importance of the study of other mathematics components such as number sense and number operations, measurement, geometry, data analysis and probability and problem solving. The curriculum focuses on each of these components beginning in kindergarten. Number sense is developed through a variety of concrete models, allowing students to use the area of the brain used for the comprehension of mathematical knowledge. Students are prepared to be fluent in computation using formal algorithms and learn essential measurement and data analysis skills. Students also learn to make connections and apply mathematical knowledge through problem solving and inquiry.

In grades K-2, algebraic awareness, number sense and computational fluency are the main focus of students' learning. Students develop the skills necessary to progress into higher level mathematics; through open-ended problem solving, they increase their critical thinking skills and ability to see connections across mathematics as well as other subjects. In grades 3-5, learning shifts from computation to fractional awareness. The part-to-whole relationships developed in these early grades leads to a deeper understanding of fractions, percents, and decimals and computation. Algebraic skills move from pattern recognition and development to the creation of equations and the use of variables. As students move into grades 6 through 8, the focus shifts to the study of algebra and functions. Number sense remains a critical focus area through the study of integers, rational and irrational numbers, exponents, and absolute values. Conceptual ideas are integrated through lab activities that provide exploratory opportunities for students to explicitly connect abstract ideas to concrete examples.

The mathematics curriculum also ensures that students become effective as mathematical communicators by engaging them in thinking, reading, and writing about mathematics to help them understand the foundational concepts necessary for success in more complex mathematical coursework.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State mathematics examination.

In 2009-10 and 2010-11, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the state's Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores on the New York State mathematics examination⁴.

⁴ In order to abide by the measures to which schools are held accountable in their school's Accountability Plans, the Institute will continue to use the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, which provide year-to-year consistency with the Plan's standard while accounting for the timing of the test administration (i.e., SED now gives the test later in the school year).

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in grade three in May 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	656
4	655
5	653
6	653
7	651
8	652

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 been enrolled for less than one year.

**2010-11 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁵			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	52	-	-	-	52
All	52	-	-	-	52

Results

Of students at Brooklyn Dreams, the overall percent of students achieving a Scale Score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score is 96%. However, since Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, none of these students are in their second year.

**Charter School Performance on 2010-11 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
-------	------------	--	------------------

⁵ 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

3	All Students	96%	52
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	-	-
All	All Students	96%	52
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	-	-

Evaluation

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met this measure.

Additional Evidence

The 2010-11 data will serve as Brooklyn Dreams’ first data point for the New York State English language arts assessment. The Northwest Evaluation Association’s measure of academic progress shows that students at Brooklyn Dreams grew at an accelerated rate during the 2010-11 school year in mathematics. Compared to the national average of 100%, students at Brooklyn Dreams grew 123% in math.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11	
	2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested
3	n/a	n/a
All	n/a	n/a

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) 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 all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state’s learning standards in Mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s mathematics AMO.

As SED has not yet determined this year’s AMO, schools need not calculate their Performance Index and may omit reporting on this measure.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

Tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year are compared to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students and the results for the respective grades in the local school district, as well as between the total result of students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for the corresponding grades in the school district.

Results

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met this measure.

**2010-11 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	n/a	n/a	62%	2975
All	n/a	n/a	63%	16343

Evaluation

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met this measure. However, we note that 96% of third grade students enrolled at Brooklyn Dreams for just one year scored at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Scores, compared to 63% of third grade students in the district public schools.

Additional Evidence

As stated above, the 2010-11 data will serve as Brooklyn Dreams’ first data point for the New York State English language arts assessment. The Northwest Evaluation Association’s measure of academic progress shows that students at Brooklyn Dreams grew at an accelerated rate during the 2010-11 school year in mathematics. Compared to the national average of 100%, students at Brooklyn Dreams grew 123% in mathematics.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students	
	2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District
3	n/a	62%
All	n/a	63%

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school’s actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school’s actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, no data from the 2009-10 school year is available.

Goal 1: Growth Measure

On the current year’s state mathematics exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year’s state mathematics exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

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 towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2010-11 and also have a state exam score in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met this measure.

Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2009-10 to 2010-11

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
All	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Evaluation

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met this measure.

Additional Evidence

As stated above, the 2010-11 data will serve as Brooklyn Dreams’ first data point for the New York State English language arts assessment. The Northwest Evaluation Association’s measure of academic progress shows that students at Brooklyn Dreams grew at an accelerated rate during the 2010-11 school year in mathematics. Compared to the national average of 100%, students at Brooklyn Dreams grew 123% in mathematics.

**Cohort Performance on Mathematics Exam
Since the Advent of the Grades 3-8 Testing Program by School Year**

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2007-08	Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010 and is therefore unable to compare cohorts from previous years.		
2008-09			
2009-10			
2010-11			

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Because Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010, we are unable to determine whether the school met its accountability plan measures in mathematics. However, 96% of first year students scored above the time adjusted Level 3 Cut Sores.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on	n/a

	the New York State examination.	
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	n/a
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	n/a
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	n/a
Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	n/a

Action Plan

Brooklyn Dreams students performed favorably on the state mathematics assessment. The school will continue working until all students perform at or above Level 3 on the exam. Due to the positive results, the school will continue implementing and supporting the mathematics program as done in 2009-10.

NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB

Under the state's NCLB Accountability system, the School's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.

Goal 5: Absolute Measure

Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.

Method

Since *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 the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards which indicate each school's status under the state's NCLB accountability system. For a school's status to be "Good Standing" it must not have failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years.

Results

Brooklyn Dreams' accountability status for the 2009-10 school year is in "good standing."

Evaluation

Brooklyn Dreams met this measure. The school was deemed in "good standing" for the 2009-10 school year.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Dreams has been deemed a school in "good standing" each year of its charter to date.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2010-11	Good Standing

NATIONAL NORM REFERENCED ASSESSMENT

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

The school will be above average (>50%) for students making growth (combination of reading, math, and language usage).

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 towards the desirable outcome of grade level or an NCE of 50.

The school administered the Northwest Evaluation Association Primary Grade Assessment (PGA) to grades K-1 and the NWEA Measure of Academic Performance MAP) to grades 2-3 in reading, language usage, and mathematics in the fall, winter and spring of the 2010-11 school year. The norm-referenced test measures student growth against a national sample of approximately 3 million students. Success on this measure is indicated by a higher rate of growth and greater incidence of meeting typical growth from year to year.

Results

In 2010-11, 75.7% met or exceeded typical growth on the NWEA Primary Grades Assessments (K-1) and the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (2-3). Using Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE), as outlined in the format provided by the Charter Schools Institute, 52.0% of students scored above an NCE of 50 and students scored an average NCE of 49.6.

Cohort Growth on Cohort Growth on the NWEA assessments from Fall 2010 to Spring 2011

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Meeting NWEA Typical Growth	
		2010-11	
K	40	90.5%	
1	51	83.2%	
2	51	65.5%	
3	52	75.2%	
All	194	75.7%	

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50			Target Achieved
		2000-10	Target	2010-11	
K	40	n/a	50%	69.6%	Yes
1	51		50%	52.5%	Yes
2	50		50%	47.0%	No

3	52		50%	42.9%	No
All	193	n/a	n/a	52.0%	Yes

Grade	Cohort Size	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
K	40	n/a	50	60.2	Yes
1	51		50	51.5	Yes
2	50		50	46.9	No
3	52		50	45.5	No
All	193	n/a	50	49.6	No

Evaluation

Brooklyn Dreams met this measure, with 75.7% of students meeting typical growth. It also met this measure using the percent of students performing at or above the NCE of 50. However, the average NCE score fell 0.4 points short of 50.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Dreams met this measure, with 75.7% of students meeting typical growth. In addition, each individual cohort met this measure, notably with 90.5% of kindergarten students meeting or exceeding typical growth. Brooklyn Dreams also met this measure using the percent of students performing at or above the NCE of 50. However, the average NCE score fell 0.4 points short of 50.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

The median percentile for students in the spring of their 3rd year will be \geq 50 (combination of reading, math, and language usage) by the spring of their 3rd year.

Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010 and is therefore unable to report on students in the spring of their third year.

Goal 3: Growth Measure

The school will meet or exceed the growth of comparable students (using NWEA GRD) for 17 of 24 comparison categories by the 3rd year, e.g. grade 2 reading is one category, grade 3 reading is another category, etc. Typical numbers of categories by the 3rd year would be 24.

Brooklyn Dreams opened in the fall of 2010 and is therefore unable to report on students in the spring of their third year.