



**BRONX CHARTER SCHOOL FOR
BETTER LEARNING**

**2013-14 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 11, 2014

By Kevin B. Brennan, Ed.D., Executive Director
3740 Baychester Ave. – Annex
Bronx, NY 10466
718-655-6660

www.bronxbetterlearning.org

Dr. Kevin Brennan, Dr. Theodore Swartz and Simeon Stolzberg prepared this 2013-14 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Kimberly Kelly	Board Chairperson, Complaint Review Committee, Teacher Employment Committee, Strategic Planning Committee
Marvin Waldman	Vice-Chairperson, Fundraising/Development Committee, Policy/Governance Committee, Strategic Planning Committee
Marilyn Maye	Treasurer, Finance/Audit Committee, Strategic Planning Committee, Education Committee
William Bernhardt	Secretary, Teacher Employment Committee, Policy/Governance Committee, Strategic Planning Committee, Education Committee
Jefferyson Barnes	Fundraising/Development Committee
Robert Bata	Fundraising/Development Committee, Policy/Governance Committee, Strategic Planning Committee
Andrew Waldman	Finance/Audit Committee, Complaint Review Committee, Fundraising/Development Committee
Sheryl Jackson	Parent Representative, Complaint Review Committee, Teacher Employment Committee, Governance/Policy Committee, Education Committee
Woody Swain	Finance/Audit Committee, Education Committee
Gregg Swain	Teacher Employment Committee, Fundraising/Development Committee

Dr. Kevin B. Brennan has served as the Executive Director since June 2010.

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Trustees of the State University of New York approved the application for the Bronx Charter School for Better Learning (Bronx Better Learning) on February 23, 2003; it was subsequently approved by the Board of Regents on March 25, 2003. Bronx Better Learning opened in the fall of 2003 with an enrollment of 50 students in Grade 1, added one grade each year thereafter, and enrolled 285 students in Grades 1 – 5 in the fall of 2007, the final year of its original charter term. On January 15, 2008, the State University Trustees granted Bronx Better Learning a full-term charter renewal for 5 years, authorizing the school to provide instruction in Grades K – 5 through the 2012-13 school year. Bronx Better Learning added a Kindergarten program in the fall of 2008 and served 345 students in grades K – 5. In 2010-11 the school enrolled 386 students in those same grades. On March 4, 2013, the State University Trustees granted another full five year renewal of the charter for Bronx Charter School for Better Learning. Additionally, on June 4, 2014, the State University Trustees approved the replication of BBL and, in turn, the opening of BBL II for September 2015. As part of the approval to replicate BBL, the SUNY Trustees approved BBL's adding an additional five classrooms over the next three years.

Bronx Better Learning originally located in a facility leased from the Bronx Bethany Church of the Nazarene at 971 East 227th Street in the Bronx. Following the first year of operation, BBL reached a shared space agreement with the New York City Department of Education, through which BBL received permission to locate in the annex portion of P.S. 111 (Seton Falls Elementary School) at 3740 Baychester Avenue in the Bronx. The school used 3 classrooms and an office in the main building of P.S. 111 for the first time in 2008-09 to accommodate its growth in enrollment. Its new Kindergarten classes were situated there in 2008-09, replaced by 5th grade in 2009-10. Beginning September 2014, BBL is occupying three additional classrooms in the main building and is scheduled to add another two classrooms for the 2015-16 school year.

The mission of the Bronx Charter School for Better Learning is as follows:

The Bronx Charter School for Better Learning provides its students with a solid foundation for academic success, through achievement that exceeds citywide averages and meets or exceeds New York State standards and national norms in all curriculum areas tested, especially in mathematics and language arts. Our teaching constantly adjusts to the needs of our students, leading to independence, autonomy, responsibility and a sustained love of learning, all of which contribute directly to high academic achievement.

To fulfill its mission, the school's teachers endeavor to practice *the subordination of teaching to learning*, an instructional approach that does not dominate learning, but rather is guided by it. Implementing the approach involves: getting students actively and mentally engaged in lessons; assisting students to go beyond rote memorization, wherever the subject matter allows, and to develop criteria for understanding; recognizing every child's high intellectual capacity and, thereby, welcoming errors in students' work as guides to help them harness that capacity; promoting students' use of what they know to master new content; and encouraging student initiative and self-sufficiency.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2010-11	65	66	63	66	60	53								373
2011-12	69	69	69	66	61	52								386
2012-13	72	72	70	63	62	56								395
2013-14	89	72	72	72	57	58								420

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will become proficient readers and writers of the English Language.

Background

BBL continues its focus on four priorities: 1) Instructional Rigor, to ensure that every student receives an instructional program that is rigorous and enriching; 2) Data Based Decision Making, to ensure that all instructional decisions are based on student performance; 3) Meeting Individual Student Needs, to ensure that the instructional program regularly adapts to meet the needs of each student; 4) Student Empowerment, to ensure that through an instructional program that emphasizes engagement, effort and efficacy all students sustain a personal sense of their own innate abilities.

During the 2013-14 school year, the Bronx Charter School for Better Learning (BBL) continued its strong commitment to ensuring a quality ELA program for all of its students, through the delivery of a comprehensive and challenging instructional program that is aligned with the New York State Common Core Standards by:

- Continuing to emphasize the consistent application of Bronx Better Learning’s pedagogical approach, the *subordination of teaching to learning*;
- Continuing to refine the curriculum to ensure its alignment with the State’s Common Core Standards;
- Continuing to incorporate as part of its reading foundation the use Reader’s Workshop and Writer’s Workshop throughout the school;
- Continuing to foster a joy for reading through the Growing Great Readers program;
- Continuing to support the increased reading proficiency through the Accelerated Readers program;
- Continuing to foster the expansion of the students’ vocabulary through the use of the Word of the Day during the school’s morning broadcast;
- Continuing to make available to all students access to an extensive classroom library and school library;
- Continuing to closely monitor each student’s progress through the use of regularly scheduled interim assessments and the scheduling of a monthly “Data Day;”
- Continuing to provide supplemental support to students identified as not progressing as expected;
- Continuing to provide professional development through our in-house professional development specialists to both teachers and assistants to further ensure each person’s readiness to support the needs of all of our students;
- Continuing to utilize writing rubrics that are aligned with the State’s Common Core Standards; and
- Increasing feedback to teachers and assistants on their instructional approach through increasing the frequency of classroom observations by administration.

Goal 1: 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 English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3rd through 5th grade in April 2014. 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.

**2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ¹			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	72	0	0	0	72
4	57	0	0	0	57
5	58	0	0	0	58
All	187	0	0	0	187

Results

On the 2013-14 state ELA exam, 46% of all students scored at the proficient or above level, and about the same percentage of continuously enrolled students scored at that level. Almost half of 4th grade students were proficient or above.

**Performance on 2013-14 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	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	44.4	72	43.5	69
4	47.4	57	49.1	53
5	44.8	58	44.8	58
All	45.5	187	45.6	180

¹ 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.

Evaluation

The school did not meet the measure. Overall it fell about 30 percentage points below the 75% proficient target. There was slight variation among grades, with the 4th grade having the largest percentage of students proficient, followed by the 5th grade and then the 3rd grade.

Additional Evidence

The school demonstrated considerable growth from the previous year's test, increasing proficiency by 12 percentage points from 34% in 2012-13 to 46% proficient this year. We attribute that significant growth to continued alignment of the curriculum and instruction to Common Core standards and to the long-term effect of the professional development provided to teachers and assistants. Ensuring high quality instruction and a well defined and meaningful curriculum have led to the considerable growth over the previous year's test.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	72.6	62	30.6	62	43.5	69
4	87.9	58	36.1	61	49.1	53
5	94.2	52	33.9	56	44.8	58
All	84.3	172	33.5	179	45.6	180

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 English language arts AMO of 89. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.²

² In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

Results

The school's Performance Index was 127, which exceeds the AMO of 89.

English Language Arts 2013-14 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	18.7	35.8	38.5	7.0

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc} \text{PI} & = & 36 & + & 39 & + & 7 & = & 81 \\ & & & & 39 & + & 7 & = & \underline{46} \\ & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 127 \end{array}$$

Evaluation

The school met the measure. It far exceeded the AMO by 38 points.

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 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

With 46% percent of students scoring at the proficient or above level, the school far exceeded the district's performance of 21% at this level.

³ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access 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](#).

**2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	43.5	69	22.4	3246
4	49.1	53	22.8	3143
5	44.8	58	18.8	3095
All	45.6	180	21.4	9484

Evaluation

The school met this measure. It far exceeded the district’s performance by 24 percentage points.

Additional Evidence

The school has increased the gap between its and the district’s performance. In 2012-13 the school exceeded the district 13 points; in 2013-14 it exceeded the district by 24 point

**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 Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	56.5	39.8	30.6	21.0	43.5	22.4
4	53.4	46.2	36.1	20.0	49.1	22.8
5	63.5	46.2	33.9	20.6	44.8	18.8
All	57.6	44.0	33.5	20.5	45.6	21.4

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 small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.⁴

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. 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 economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' 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 small 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 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

Results

The school had an overall effect size of 0.87 in 2012-13, which was higher than expected to a large degree.

2012-13 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		63	31.7	23.6	8.1	0.60
4		62	35.5	21.1	14.4	1.11
5		56	34.0	21.9	12.1	0.90
All	76.9	181	33.7	22.2	11.5	0.87

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to a large degree

Evaluation

⁴ The Institute will continue using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

The school met this measure. No grade had an effect size below 0.60 and the 4th grade had an effect size of 1.11.

Additional Evidence

The school has continued to improve on this measure. In 2010-11 it had a negative effect size, but increased to 0.61 in 2011-12 and to 0.87 in 2012-13.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2010-11	3 - 5	59.0	175	42.9	48.5	-0.4
2011-12	3 - 5	64.0	178	57.9	48.7	0.61
2012-13	3 - 5	76.9	181	33.7	22.2	0.87

Goal 1: Growth Measure⁵

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

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2012-13 and also have a state exam score from 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 score are ranked by their 2012-13 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 statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁶

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

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

Results

The school's Mean Growth Percentile was 53.5.

2012-13 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	BBL	Statewide Mean
3	NA	NA
4	50	50
5	55	50
All	52.5	50

Evaluation

The school met this measure. Its overall mean growth percentile exceeded the state median by 2.5 points.

Additional Evidence

While the school exceeded the statewide average, its mean growth percentile of 52.5 was down from the previous year's percentile of 61.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2010-11 ⁷	2011-12	2012-13	2012-13 Statewide Average
3	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	55.5	50	50
5	NA	67	55	50
All	NA	61	52.5	50

⁷ Grade level results not available.

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

The school met all of the measures in this goal except the absolute target of 75 percent proficient. However, given the state’s realignment of the state tests to Common Core standards, the school performed quite well compared to statewide performance. It easily achieved its AMO and outperformed the local school district by a wide margin.

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.	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state English language arts exam will meet that year’s Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
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 local school district.	Achieved
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 2012-13 school district results.)	Achieved
Growth	Each year, under the state’s Growth Model the school’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile.	Achieved

Action Plan

While students throughout the testing grades continue to demonstrate noteworthy achievement (three years of consistent improvement in student performance on the NYS ELA assessment), placing them in the top 20% of all New York State schools in ELA (Grade 5: top 16%; Grade 4: top 17%; Grade 3: top 22%), there is room for further growth. As such, Bronx Better Learning continues its commitment to ensuring that all of its students perform excellently in ELA. To facilitate the continued growth of our students, the following actions will be taken:

1. Instructional Rigor: The ELA program will continue to focus on facilitating the development of effective language skills for all students through:
 - a. Academic Leaders: Academic Leaders have been placed at each grade level to ensure consistent delivery of a rigorous and meaningful instructional program, including facilitating the ongoing process of collaborative planning, the review of weekly lesson plans and aligning of the overall instructional program with the high expectations articulated through the common core standards.
 - b. Instructional Assessment: The Board of Trustees has appointed an Assistant Principal to assist in frequent in-class observations and to provide regular feedback to teachers and assistants on the quality of the instructional program.

- c. Data Driven Decision Making: Frequently scheduled interim assessments will help monitor student progress and to identify where the instructional program requires modification to better support student learning.
 - d. Growing Great Readers and Accelerated Readers Programs: To increase the effectiveness of the Growing Great Readers and Accelerated Readers Programs, the Board of Trustees has appointed a Coordinator to expand opportunities for all students to regularly access challenging reading material.
- 2. Focus on At-Risk Students: The ELA program will expand its support for students identified as being at-risk and with special needs through:
 - a. Experienced Teachers: The Academic Leaders, who represent some of BBL's most experienced and effective teachers, will serve as the support teachers for the at-risk students, with the in-house professional development specialists working directly with them and their students to ensure the precision of each student's instructional program.
 - b. Special Education Instructional Options: Students identified in need of special education support services will continue to have access to a variety of services, including cooperative teaching intervention (CTI) classes, SETSS provided as either push-in or pull-out services, and related services, e.g., speech, occupational therapy and counseling.
 - c. English Language Learner (ELL) Program/Support: With the increase in the number of ELLs students (12% of the Kindergarten is eligible for ELL services), the ELL Coordinator's schedule ensures the effective delivery of needed support.
- 3. Professional Development: The ELA program will ensure that all teachers are effectively prepared to provide students with the highest quality of instruction through:
 - a. Director of Professional Development: To further ensure the effective application of all professional development services, including in-house Professional Development Specialists, Academic Leaders and contracted professional development consultants, the Board of Trustees has appointed a Director of Professional Development.
 - b. Daily Institutes: The in-house Professional Development Specialists and the Academic Leaders have arranged a weekly institutes schedule that will focus on the continued application of the school's pedagogy throughout the school.
 - c. In-Class Support: Professional development will continue to push-in to the classrooms to provide teachers and assistants with direct feedback on instructional practices and to provide examples that illustrate in "real situations" the effectiveness of the school's approach.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

Background

BBL continues its focus on four priorities: 1) Instructional Rigor, to ensure that every student receives an instructional program that is rigorous and enriching; 2) Data Based Decision Making, to ensure that all instructional decisions are based on student performance; 3) Meeting Individual Student Needs, to ensure that the instructional program regularly adapts to meet the needs of each student; 4) Student Empowerment, to ensure that through an instructional program that emphasizes engagement, effort and efficacy all students sustain a personal sense of their own innate abilities.

The Bronx Charter School for Better Learning continues to demonstrate a strong commitment to those school-wide priorities and, in turn, to ensuring the delivery of a challenging and meaningful instructional program in mathematics for all of its students by:

- Continuing to review the mathematics curriculum to ensure that the pacing of the instructional program effectively supports student learning of the full scope of the Common Core Standards;
- Continuing to maintain a strong commitment to the Bronx Better Learning's pedagogical approach, the subordination of teaching to learning;
- Continuing to consistently apply the use of manipulatives, primarily Cuisenaire rods, to ensure, even in the earliest stages, that students develop models for thinking mathematically;
- Continuing to provide supplemental support to students identified as not progressing as expected;
- Continuing to provide professional development, through our in-house professional development specialists, to both teachers and assistants to further ensure each person's readiness to support the needs of all of our students;
- Increasing feedback to teachers and assistants on their instructional approach through increasing the frequency of classroom observations by administration;
- Continuing to emphasize the development of two essential skills, i.e., becoming swift and accurate in their computation skills and increasing the student's ability to effectively focus on problem solving activities that involve practice and real world application of those skills; and
- Continuing to ensure that instructional decisions are made based on specific student performance data. As with ELA, teachers utilize both formative and summative assessments, along with real-time moment-to-moment analysis of how students are responding to instruction, throughout the school year, to gather and analyze student performance data to ensure that each student's individual needs are being addressed,

including scheduling an early dismissal for the last Wednesday of each month for use by teachers as a “data day” to review and analyze student performance data.

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 5th grade in April 2014. 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.

**2013-14 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁸			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	72	0	0	0	72
4	57	0	0	0	57
5	58	0	0	0	58
All	187	0	0	0	187

Results

The percentage of continuously enrolled students who scored at the proficient or above level was 68%. In the 3rd grade, 55% scored at this level while 83 percent of 4th grade students did so.

**Performance on 2013-14 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	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	54.2	72	55.1	69
4	82.5	57	83.0	53
5	69.0	58	69.0	58
All	67.4	187	67.8	180

⁸ 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.

Evaluation

The school did not meet this measure. Overall, it was seven percentage points below the target of 75%. However, the 4th grade exceeded this target by eight points.

Additional Evidence

The school demonstrated significant gains from the previous year. It increased from 44% last year to 68% proficient or above this year, a jump of 24 points. The 5th grade jumped from 34% at or above proficient to 69% at that level.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	100.0	62	40.3	62	55.1	69
4	96.6	58	57.4	61	83.0	53
5	100.0	52	33.9	56	69.0	58
All	98.8	172	44.1	179	67.8	180

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 mathematics AMO of 86. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.⁹

Results

The school has a PLI of 158 compared to the AMO of 86.

⁹ In contrast to NYSED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

Mathematics 2013-14 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	17	44	66	60

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 24 & + & 35 & + & 32 & = & 91 \\
 & & & & 35 & + & 32 & = & \underline{67} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 158
 \end{array}$$

Evaluation

The school met this measure. Its PLI of 158 exceeded the AMO by 72 points.

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 local school district.

Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.¹⁰

Results

Overall 68% of students scored at or above the proficient level, compared to 30% of district students in the same grades.

2013-14 State Mathematics Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	55.1	69	29.2	3297
4	83.0	53	32.6	3187
5	69.0	58	26.8	3144
All	67.8	180	29.6	9628

¹⁰ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access 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](#).

Evaluation

The school met this measure. It outperformed the district by approximately 38 percentage points.

Additional Evidence

The school has continued to outperform the district and has increased the gap from 21 percentage points last year to 38 percentage points this year.

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					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	77.4	45.5	40.3	23.8	55.1	29.2
4	72.4	59.3	57.4	24.1	83.0	32.6
5	88.5	58.2	33.9	21.5	69.0	26.8
All	79.1	54.2	44.1	23.1	67.8	29.6

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 small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.¹¹

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. 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 economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' 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 small 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 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

¹¹ The Institute will continue using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

Results

The school had an overall Effect Size of 1.11. The lowest Effect Size was 0.75 for the 5th grade and the highest was 1.73 for the 4th grade.

2012-13 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			41.3	26.9	14.4	0.82
4			56.4	26.8	29.6	1.73
5			34.0	22.1	11.9	0.75
All	76.9	181	44.2	25.4	18.8	1.11

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to a large degree

Evaluation

The school met this measure. Its Effect Size was higher than expected to a large degree and all three grades individually exceeded the target of 0.3

Additional Evidence

The school has consistently performed higher than expected to a large degree.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2010-11	3 – 5	59.0	175	73.7	57.7	0.9
2011-12	3 - 5	64.0	178	78.7	58.2	1.15
2012-13	3 - 5	76.9	181	44.2	25.4	1.11

Goal 2: Growth Measure¹²

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

¹² See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

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 2012-13 and also have a state exam score in 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 scores are ranked by their 2012-13 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.¹³

In 2012-13 the school's overall mean growth percentile was 61.5.

2012-13 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	BBL	Statewide Average
3	NA	50NA
4	61	50
5	55	50
All	58	50

Evaluation

The school exceeded the statewide mean of 50 by 8 points.

¹³ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

Additional Evidence

The school’s mean growth percentile remained steady, from 2011-12 to 2012-13, at 58 points..

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2010-11 ¹⁴	2011-12 ¹⁴	2012-13	2012-13 Statewide Average
3	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	49	61	50
5	NA	67	55	50
All	NA	58	58	50

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

The school met all but one of the measures in this goal. It came close to meeting the absolute measure of 75% proficient. It far exceeded the performance of the local district and similar schools statewide. Finally, it has demonstrated strong growth compared to the state average.

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.	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year’s Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
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 local school district.	Achieved
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 2012-13 school district results.)	Achieved
Growth	Each year, under the state’s Growth Model the school’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile.	Achieved

Action Plan

While students throughout the testing grades continue to demonstrate noteworthy achievement (three years of consistent improvement in student performance on the NYS mathematics

¹⁴ Grade level results not available.

assessment), placing them in the top 20% of all New York State schools in mathematics (Grade 5: top 9%; Grade 4: top 2%; Grade 3: top 20%), there is room for further. As such, Bronx Better Learning continues its commitment to ensuring that all of its students perform excellently in mathematics. To facilitate the continued growth of our students, the following actions will be taken:

1. Instructional Rigor: The mathematics program will continue to focus on facilitating the development of effective computational skills for all students through:
 - a. Academic Leaders: Academic Leaders have been placed at each grade level to ensure consistent delivery of a rigorous and meaningful instructional program, including facilitating the ongoing process of collaborative planning, the review of weekly lesson plans and aligning of the overall instructional program with the high expectations articulated through the common core standards.
 - b. Instructional Assessment: The Board of Trustees has appointed an Assistant Principal to assist in frequent in-class observations and to provide regular feedback to teachers and assistants on the quality of the instructional program.
 - c. Data Driven Decision Making: Frequently scheduled interim assessments will help monitor student progress and to identify where the instructional program requires modification to better support student learning.
 - d.
2. Focus on At-Risk Students: The Mathematics program will expand its support for students identified as being at-risk and with special needs through:
 - a. Experienced Teachers: The Academic Leaders, who represent some of BBL's most experienced and effective teachers, will serve as the support teachers for the at-risk students, with the in-house professional development specialists working directly with them and their students to ensure the precision of each student's instructional program.
 - b. Special Education Instructional Options: Students identified in need of special education support services will continue to have access to a variety of services, including cooperative teaching intervention (CTI) classes, SETSS provided as either push-in or pull-out services, and related services, e.g., speech, occupational therapy and counseling.
 - c. English Language Learner (ELL) Program/Support: With the increase in the number of ELLs students (12% of the Kindergarten is eligible for ELL services), the ELL Coordinator's schedule ensures the effective delivery of needed support.
3. Professional Development: The mathematics program will ensure that all teachers are effectively prepared to provide students with the highest quality of instruction through:
 - a. Director of Professional Development: To further ensure the effective application of all professional development services, including in-house Professional Development Specialists, Academic Leaders and contracted professional development consultants, the Board of Trustees has appointed a Director of Professional Development.
 - b. Daily Institutes: The in-house Professional Development Specialists and the Academic Leaders have arranged a weekly institutes schedule that will focus on the continued application of the school's pedagogy throughout the school.
 - c. In-Class Support: Professional development will continue to push-in to the classrooms to provide teachers and assistants with direct feedback on instructional

practices and to provide examples that illustrate in “real situations” the effectiveness of the school’s approach.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

Background

BBL continues its focus on four priorities: 1) Instructional Rigor, to ensure that every student receives an instructional program that is rigorous and enriching; 2) Data Based Decision Making, to ensure that all instructional decisions are based on student performance; 3) Meeting Individual Student Needs, to ensure that the instructional program regularly adapts to meet the needs of each student; 4) Student Empowerment, to ensure that through an instructional program that emphasizes engagement, effort and efficacy all students sustain a personal sense of their own innate abilities.

The Bronx Charter School for Better Learning continues to strongly promote effective student mastery of the State’s Common Core Curriculum in science by:

- Continuing to implement the Bronx Better Learning’s pedagogical approach, the subordination of teaching to learning, incorporating techniques and materials that foster students’ active participation in lessons;
- Continuing to implement lessons that emphasize hands-on experimentation and make use of BOCES prepared science kits (Science 21 Program) that complement the school’s core pedagogy;
- Continuing to incorporate a problem solving approach that presents students with “real life” problems and working in groups, which analyze data/information to come up with solutions to the problems, all of which leads students to a deeper appreciation of cause and effect relationships; and
- Continuing to provide supplemental support to students who are not progressing as expected.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th grade in spring 2014. 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 (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at proficiency.

Results

All students were proficient on the 4th grade state science exam.

**Charter School Performance on 2013-14 State Science Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	100.0	57	N/A	N/A

Evaluation

The school met this measure. It far exceeded the target of 75% proficient by having all students proficient.

Additional Evidence

The school has consistently met this measure with no less than 98% proficient in any of the last three years.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	98.0	58	98.4	61	100.0	57
All	98.0	58	98.4	61	100.0	57

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 local school district.

Method

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the local school district.

Results

District science results are unavailable.

**2013-14 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	100.0	57	N/A	N/A

Evaluation

This measure cannot be determined because district results are unavailable.

Additional Evidence

District results are unavailable making it impossible to evaluate trends over time.

**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					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	98	N/A	98	N/A	100	N/A
All	98	N/A	98	N/A	100	N/A

Summary of the Science Goal

With 100% of students proficient in science, the school has met this goal.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Achieved
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 local school district.	N/A

Action Plan

The students continue to perform exceptionally well on the NYS science assessment – achieving 100% passing for the 2013-2014 school year. While student progress in science continues to be laudable, as with ELA and mathematics, the Board of Trustees continues to ensure that the science program maintains its high standards of support for all students and to aggressively ensure that the program continues to be refined and improved, specifically through:

1. **Instructional Rigor:** The science program will continue to focus on facilitating the development of effective analytical skills for all students through:
 - a. **Academic Leaders** have been placed at each grade level to ensure consistent delivery of a rigorous and meaningful instructional program, including facilitating the ongoing process of collaborative planning, the review of weekly lesson plans and aligning of the overall instructional program with the high expectations articulated through the common core standards.
 - b. **Instructional Assessment:** The Board of Trustees has appointed an Assistant Principal to assist in frequent in-class observations and to provide regular feedback to teachers and assistants on the quality of the instructional program.
 - c. **Data Driven Decision Making:** Frequently scheduled interim assessments will help monitor student progress and to identify where the instructional program requires modification to better support student learning.
2. **Focus on At-Risk Students:** The science program will expand its support for students identified as being at-risk and with special needs through:
 - a. **Experienced Teachers:** The Academic Leaders, who represent some of BBL’s most experienced and effective teachers, will serve as the support teachers for the at-risk students, with the in-house professional development specialists working directly with them and their students to ensure the precision of each student’s instructional program.
 - b. **Special Education Instructional Options:** Students identified in need of special education support services will continue to have access to a variety of services, including cooperative teaching intervention (CTI) classes, SETSS provided as either push-in or pull-out services, and related services, e.g., speech, occupational therapy and counseling.
 - c. **English Language Learner (ELL) Program/Support:** With the increase in the number of ELLs students (12% of the Kindergarten is eligible for ELL services), the ELL Coordinator’s schedule ensures the effective delivery of needed support.
3. **Professional Development:** The science program will ensure that all teachers are effectively prepared to provide students with the highest quality of instruction through:
 - a. **Director of Professional Development:** To further ensure the effective application of all professional development services, including in-house Professional Development Specialists, Academic Leaders and contracted professional development consultants, the Board of Trustees has appointed a Director of Professional Development.
 - b. **Daily Institutes:** The in-house Professional Development Specialists and the Academic Leaders have arranged a weekly Institute schedule that will focus on the continued application of the school’s pedagogy throughout the school.
 - c. **In-Class Support:** Professional development will continue to push-in to the classrooms to provide teachers and assistants with direct feedback on instructional

practices and to provide examples that illustrate in “real situations” the effectiveness of the school’s approach.

NCLB

Goal 4: NCLB

The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

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

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 state proficiency standards. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards. The report cards indicate each school’s status under the state’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

Results

Bronx Better Learning is in good standing.

Evaluation

The school has met this measure and achieved the goal.

Additional Evidence

The school has consistently been in good standing

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2011-12	Good Standing
2012-13	Good Standing
2013-14	Good Standing