



Brooklyn Dreams Charter School

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

October 19, 2018

By Brooklyn Dreams Charter School

Board of Trustees

259 Parkville

Brooklyn, NY 11230

718-859-8400

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

National Heritage Academies prepared this 2017-18 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

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

Omar Thomas has served as the principal since May 2016.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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 2017-18 school year, we served 634 students in grades K-8, of whom 85.5 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 we recognize that parental involvement is a key indicator of student success. We work

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

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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	9	10	11	12	Total
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
2017-18	74	65	70	77	74	67	69	62	67	-	-	-	-	625

GOAL 1: 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 2018. 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).

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ²				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	77	0	0	0	0	77
4	76	0	0	0	0	76
5	69	0	0	0	1	73
6	69	0	1	0	0	70
7	62	0	0	0	0	64
8	66	0	0	0	0	69
All	419	0	1	0	1	429

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In 2017-18, 49% of students enrolled in at least their second year achieved a level 3 or higher on the New York State ELA exam. This is below the expected rate, and therefore, this goal was not met.

Performance on 2017-18 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	55%	77	62%	60
4	51%	76	54%	61
5	30%	69	30%	50
6	51%	68	58%	52
7	34%	62	31%	45
8	53%	66	52%	58
All	46%	418	49%	326

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

We are making progress toward this goal, as the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year achieving proficiency has increased for the past three years. Over three years, the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year achieving proficiency has increased by 13 percentage points.

ELA Performance by Grade Level and Year

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.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	36.9%	65	63.5%	63	62%	60
4	51.5%	66	45.6%	57	54%	61
5	31.1%	61	47.5%	59	30%	50
6	31.8%	66	26.3%	57	58%	52
7	30.0%	50	39.0%	64	31%	45
8	34.8%	46	54.5%	44	52%	58
All	36.4%	354	45.9%	344	49%	326

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the State English language arts exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the English language arts test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2017-18 English language arts MIP for all students. The state plans to calculate and disseminate the MIP in summer 2018. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The 2017-18 Performance Index (PI) was 132.2, meeting the state's Measure of Interim Progress (MIP) of 101. Therefore, this goal was met.

English Language Arts 2017-18 Performance Index

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
418	20.1%	33.7%	34.0%	12.2%

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PI} &= 33.7 + 34.0 + 12.2 = 79.9 \\
 &+ 34.0 + 12.2 = 46.2 \\
 &+ (.5) * [12.2] = 6.1 \\
 \text{PI} &= 132.2
 \end{aligned}$$

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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.³

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the New York State ELA exam was 49%, meeting the proficiency rate of the local district at 49%, but not exceeding the local district proficiency rate. Therefore, this goal was not met.

At the grade level, this goal was met in third and sixth grade.

2017-18 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	62%	60	52%	2682
4	54%	61	55%	2688
5	30%	50	40%	2774
6	58%	52	49%	1993
7	31%	45	45%	2117
8	52%	58	55%	2036
All	49%	326	49%	14290

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Over the past three years, the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year scoring proficient has increased by 13 percentage points. Brooklyn Dreams also serves a more disadvantaged population than the local district, with 85 percent of students qualifying for free-or-reduced price lunch compared to 66 percent of students at the local district.

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

³ 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](#).

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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)	+/-
2016-17	44.5%	36.8%	7.7%	52.6%	-8.1%
2017-18	46.3%	40.8%	5.5%	58.4%	-12.1%

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					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	36.9%	46%	63.5%	46.6%	62%	52%
4	51.5%	49%	45.6%	47.1%	54%	55%
5	31.1%	41%	47.5%	40.7%	30%	40%
6	31.8%	38%	26.3%	34.1%	58%	49%
7	30.0%	39%	39.0%	46.9%	31%	45%
8	34.8%	47%	54.5%	51.2%	52%	55%
All	36.4%	43%	45.9%	44.5%	49%	49%

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 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.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In 2016-17, Brooklyn Dreams met this goal with an effect size of 1.03, which was higher than expected to a large degree.

2016-17 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	94.5	74	61	27.1	33.9	1.91
4	87.8	71	48	27.8	20.2	1.14
5	85.1	72	42	23.3	18.7	1.24
6	85.5	66	23	19.9	3.1	0.21
7	85.9	72	38	28.2	9.8	0.53
8	85.1	47	53	33.6	19.4	1.08
All	87.5	402	44	26.3	17.7	1.03

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to large degree

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The ELA effect size for the past three years has continued to increase, show a strong performance in ELA proficiency rates.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
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
2016-17	3-8	87.5	402	44	26.3	1.03

Additionally, we also evaluated Brooklyn Dreams' performance using a regression analysis based on average scaled score. Average scaled score helps capture differences between students that are just below the proficiency line, and students that are far below proficient. This metric ends up being 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.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

	ELA Scaled Score Regression		
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
CSI Proficiency Regression	0.44	0.52	1.03
Scaled Score Regression	0.78	0.81	0.84

Goal 1: Growth Measure⁴

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 target of 50.

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 2016-17 and also have a state exam score from 2015-16 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2015-16 score are ranked by their 2016-17 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 school to perform above the target for this measure, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁵

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The mean unadjusted growth percentile in ELA was 52.5, exceeded the goal of 50.0. Growth was the strongest in fourth, seventh, and eighth grade.

2016-17 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4	56	50.0
5	47	50.0
6	46	50.0
7	59	50.0
8	53	50.0
All	52.5	50.0

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

For the past three years, Brooklyn Dreams has met this goal.

⁴ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

⁵ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Target
4	44	59.5	56	50.0
5	41.5	58	47	50.0
6	60	58.5	46	50.0
7	64	53.5	59	50.0
8	--	52.5	53	50.0
All	50	56.5	52.5	50.0

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 AND EVALUATION:

	NWEA Fall-Spring Growth Percentile	
	Math	Reading
2	20	76
3	39	99
4	1	36
5	10	99
6	79	88
7	6	99
8	30	9

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:

This goal was met in reading (5 of 7 grade and subject combinations).

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 AND EVALUATION:

Overall, and in all grades except 3rd grade, the median RIT score for 3+ year students at Brooklyn Dreams was over the national average (50th percentile).

Grade	Reading Median RIT
K	--
1	--
2	59
3	47
4	53
5	51
6	51
7	57.5
8	61
All	53

SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Brooklyn Dreams met five of the seven ELA measures listed below. The first absolute measure referencing 75 percent of tested students will be proficient remains to be more of an aspirational goal for us, considering that only 45 percent of students statewide were proficient in ELA. Brooklyn Dreams continues to increase the percentage of students proficient each 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 English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	Not Met
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate PI on the state’s English language arts exam will meet that year’s state MIP as set forth in the state’s ESSA 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 English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Not 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 2016-17 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 target of 50. (Using 2016-17 results.)	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.	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

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. Feedback and additional coaching are provided during one-on-one meetings. In

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

addition, outside consultants have been hired to provide coaching to deans around the dean rubric and how they can coach teachers in relation to the classroom framework. Those same consultants have professional development and coaching sessions with the principal around the schoolwide framework and how to grow deans in the building.

- **Utilize a 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. The school has also begun professional development opportunities and norming classrooms around what rigor looks like for all students.
 - In support of the framework, the leadership team introduced instructional rounds. During this time, the leadership team conducts 15-minute classroom observations as a group 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 from the group and coaching to the teacher.

GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

All students will be proficient in mathematics

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 3rd through 8th grade in April 2018. 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.

2017-18 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁶				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	77	0	0	0	0	77
4	76	0	0	0	0	76
5	69	0	0	0	2	73
6	69	0	0	0	0	69
7	62	0	0	0	0	64
8	67	0	0	0	0	69
All	420	0	0	0	2	428

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In 2017-18, 47% of students enrolled in at least their second year achieved a level 3 or higher on the New York State math exam. This is below the expected rate, and therefore, this goal was not met.

⁶ 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.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Performance on 2017-18 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	56%	77	62%	60
4	41%	76	44%	61
5	22%	69	20%	49
6	50%	68	58%	52
7	32%	62	38%	45
8	52%	67	54%	59
All	42%	419	47%	326

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Over the past three years, the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year achieving proficiency has increased by 9 percentage points.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	47.7%	65	69.8%	63	62%	60
4	50.0%	66	50.0%	52	44%	61
5	41.0%	61	54.4%	57	20%	49
6	36.4%	66	50.0%	56	58%	52
7	20.4%	49	30.1%	63	38%	45
8	25.0%	48	27.3%	44	54%	59
All	38.0%	355	47.7%	335	47%	326

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the mathematics test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state’s 2017-18 mathematics MIP for all students. The state plans to calculate and disseminate the MIP in summer 2018. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The school’s PI on the New York State math exam was 120.95, exceeded the state’s MIP of 105. Therefore, this goal was met.

Mathematics 2017-18 Performance Level Index (PI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
419	31.0%	26.5%	23.6%	18.9%

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PI} &= 26.5 + 23.6 + 18.9 = 69 \\
 &+ 23.6 + 18.9 = 42.5 \\
 &+ (.5)[18.9] = 9.45 \\
 \text{PI} &= 120.95
 \end{aligned}$$

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.⁷

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The percent of students in at least their second year achieving proficiency was 1 percentage point greater than the local district, meeting this goal. Comparative performance was strongest in third, sixth, and eighth grade.

⁷ 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](#).

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

2017-18 State Mathematics Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	62%	60	56%	2743
4	44%	61	52%	2729
5	20%	49	46%	2807
6	58%	52	39%	2007
7	38%	45	41%	2148
8	54%	59	38%	1929
All	47%	326	46%	14363

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

For the past three years, students enrolled in at least their second year have outperformed the local district. This is an even greater accomplishment given the demographic differences between Brooklyn Dreams and 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					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	47.7%	46%	69.8%	51.8%	62%	56%
4	50.0%	45%	50.0%	47.9%	44%	52%
5	41.0%	42%	54.4%	47.5%	20%	46%
6	36.4%	38%	50.0%	37.2%	58%	39%
7	20.4%	37%	30.1%	37.2%	38%	41%
8	25.0%	34%	27.3%	32.1%	54%	38%
All	38.0%	40%	47.7%	43.3%	47%	46%

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

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In 2016-17, Brooklyn Dreams met this goal with an effect size of 0.99. Third, fourth, and fifth grade had an effect size greater than 1.0.

2016-17 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	94.5	73	67	32.2	34.8	1.69
4	87.8	66	47	27.6	19.4	1.00
5	85.1	71	49	28.3	20.7	1.11
6	85.5	66	42	23.6	18.4	0.94
7	85.9	70	27	20.6	6.4	0.32
8	85.1	47	28	13.5	14.5	0.76
All	87.5	393	44.4	25.0	19.4	0.99

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to large degree

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

For the past three years, the effect size has been positive in math.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
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
2016-17	3-8	87.5	393	44.4	32.2	0.99

We also evaluated Brooklyn Dreams' performance using a regression analysis based on average scaled score. Average scaled score helps capture differences between students that are just below

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

the proficiency line, and students that are far below proficient. This metric ends up being 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				
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
CSI Proficiency Regression	1.03	0.63	0.74	0.52	0.99
Scaled Score Regression	1.18	0.8	1.14	0.91	1.01

Goal 2: Growth Measure⁸

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 target of 50.

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 2016-17 and also have a state exam score in 2015-16 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2015-16 scores are ranked by their 2016-17 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 meet the measure, the school would have to achieve a mean growth percentile above the target of 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁹

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The unadjusted mean student growth percentile in math was 54.5, exceeding the goal of 50.0. Middle school performance was the strongest.

2016-17 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

⁸ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

⁹ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4	49	50.0
5	48	50.0
6	59.5	50.0
7	55	50.0
8	65	50.0
All	54.5	50.0

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

For the past three years, the mean student growth percentile has been near or above the state average of 50.0.

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Target
4	48.5	50	49	50.0
5	47	47.5	48	50.0
6	58	54	59.5	50.0
7	49	38	55	50.0
8	-	55	65	50.0
All	50	49	54.5	50.0

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 AND EVALUATION:

	NWEA Fall-Spring Growth Percentile	
	Math	Reading
2	20	76
3	39	99
4	1	36
5	10	99
6	79	88
7	6	99
8	30	9

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:

This goal was not met in math.

Goal 2: 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 AND EVALUATION:

In 4 out of the 7 grades the Median RIT score percentile at Brooklyn Dreams was above the 50th percentile. However, in the 3 of the grades, and overall, the median RIT score was below the 50th percentile.

Grade	Math Median RIT
K	--
1	--
2	53
3	35
4	42
5	23
6	52
7	52
8	57
All	49

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

Brooklyn Dreams met four of the seven math measures listed below. The comparative measure regarding the nationally-normed standardized assessment was missed by one point with a score of 49. The first absolute measure referencing 75 percent of tested students will be proficient remains to be more of an aspirational goal for us. Brooklyn Dreams strives to increase the percentage of students proficient each year.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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 PI on the state's English language arts exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA 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 2016-17 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 target of 50. (Using the 2016-17 results.)	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
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.	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. Feedback and additional coaching are provided during one-on-one meetings. In addition, outside consultants have been hired to provide coaching to deans around the dean rubric and how they can coach teachers in relation to the classroom framework. Those

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

same consultants have professional development and coaching sessions with the principal around the schoolwide framework and how to grow deans in the building.

- **Utilize a 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. The school has also begun professional development opportunities and norming classrooms around what rigor looks like for all students.
 - In support of the framework, the leadership team introduced instructional rounds. During this time, the leadership team conducts 15-minute classroom observations as a group 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 from the group and coaching to the teacher.

GOAL 3: 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 (NYSL) 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 or above 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 grade in spring 2018. 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 AND EVALUATION

The percent of students enrolled in at least their second year achieving proficiency on the New York State science exam was 53 percent, falling below the goal of 75 percent.

Charter School Performance on 2017-18 State Science 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
4	73%	70	72%	57
8	34%	61	33%	54
All	55%	131	53%	111

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The percent of students enrolled in at least their second year achieving proficiency in science declined from 2016-17 to 2017-18.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	81.0%	63	84.6%	52	72%	57
8	38.1%	42	50.0%	42	33%	54
All	63.8%	105	69.1%	94	53%	111

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. Given the timing of the state's release of district science data, the 2017-18 comparative data is not yet available. Schools should report comparison to the district's **2016-17** data.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing proficiency on the state science exam was 53 percent, falling below that of the local district at 76 percent. Therefore, this goal was not met.

2017-18 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 ¹⁰	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	72%	57	87%	2916
8	33%	54	60%	1931
All	53%	111	76%	4847

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Brooklyn Dreams has not met this goal over the past three years.

¹⁰ This table uses the prior year's results as 2017-18 district science scores are not yet available.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
4	81.0%	90%	84.6%	87%	72%	n/a
8	38.1%	64%	50.0%	60%	33%	n/a
All	63.8%	77%	69.1%	76%	53%	n/a

SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Brooklyn Dreams did not meet either science goal listed below but strives to increase the percentage of students proficient each year.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	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 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.	Not Met

ACTION PLAN

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

- We are working to stabilize our science teachers building wide.
- Professional Development on science curricular tools and on increasing staff expectations around science have been provided.
- We have implemented STEM Scopes, a 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.
- We are providing additional opportunities for students such as a science fair, math fair, computer and coding classes, and a recycling program. In addition, we are currently planning for the implementation of an outdoor classroom with a garden.
- An eighth grade Science Regents class has been created.
- We have begun partnerships with the School of Engineering Center for K12 STEM Education and the STEAM Initiatives program of NYC.

GOAL 4: ESSA

Goal 4: ESSA

See absolute measure

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Under the state's ESSA accountability system, the school is in good standing: the state has not identified the school for comprehensive or targeted improvement.

METHOD

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's performance standards, the federal statute 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. As New York State, like all states, is required to establish a specific system for making these determinations for its public schools, charter schools do not have latitude in establishing their own performance levels or criteria of success for meeting the ESSA accountability requirements. Each year, the state issues School Report Cards that indicate a school's status under the state accountability system.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

For the past three years, Brooklyn Dreams was in Good Standing, meeting this goal.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Brooklyn Excelsior earned 'Good Standing' in 2017-18.

Accountability Status by Year

Year	Status
2015-16	Good Standing
2016-17	Good Standing
2017-18	Good Standing

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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 2017-18 school year.

RESULTS

In 2017-18, the student attendance rate for Brooklyn Dreams Charter School was 92.1 percent.

2016-17 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
K	89.68%
1	93.37%
2	92.00%
3	92.46%
4	90.97%
5	94.85%
6	93.73%
7	94.36%
8	89.68%
Overall	92.1%

EVALUATION

With an attendance rate of 92.1 percent, Brooklyn Dreams Charter School has not met the stated measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2015-16	94.5%
2016-17	93.3%
2017-18	92.1%

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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 2017-18 school year.

RESULTS

Brooklyn Dreams has contracted with an independent certified public accounting firm to complete an audit of the 2017-18 school year. This audit is in process and will be submitted to CSI on or before November 1, 2018.

EVALUATION

Brooklyn Dreams has contracted with an independent certified public accounting firm to complete an audit of the 2017-18 school year. This audit is in process and will be submitted to CSI on or before November 1, 2018.

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 2017-18 school year.

EVALUATION

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

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.

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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 2017-18.

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.