



Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
2013-2014

BROOKLYN CHARTER SCHOOL
ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW REPORT

2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR

Part 1: School Overview

School Information for the 2013-2014 School Year

Name of Charter School	Brooklyn Charter School
Board Chair(s)	Henry Lambert
School Leader(s)	Omigbade Escayg (ED), Anthony Volforte (Principal)
Management Company (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 14
Physical Address(es)	545 Willoughby Avenue, Brooklyn 11206
Facility Owner(s)	DOE

School Profile

- Brooklyn Charter School is an elementary school, which served 258 students¹ in grades K-5 during the 2013-2014 school year and is fully at scale. It opened in 2000-2001, and is under the terms of its third charter. The school is located in publicly-operated facilities in Brooklyn within Community School District (CSD) 14.²
- Brooklyn Charter School enrolls new students in grades K-4. There were 265 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2013 lottery.³ The average attendance rate for the 2013-2014 school year to date as reported in February 2014 was 92%.⁴
- Brooklyn Charter School was renewed during the 2010-2011 school year for a full term (five years), and is consistent with the terms of its renewal application.
- The 2013-2014 school leadership team includes Omigbade Escayg, Head of School/Executive Director; Anthony Volforte, Principal; Amelia Clune, Assistant Principal; and Mary Kate Boesch, Interim Assistant Principal. The Principal joined the school at the start of the 2012-2013 school year. The Assistant Principal joined the school at the start of the 2013-2014 school year and the Interim Assistant Principal was promoted from 5th grade teacher for the 2013-2014 school year.
- Brooklyn Charter School had a student to teacher ratio of 10:1 in the 2013-2014 school year, and served 13 sections across all grades, with an average class size of 18.⁵
- The lottery preferences for Brooklyn Charter School's 2013-2014 school year included the New York State Charter Schools Act required preferences of returning students, students residing in the community school district of the school's location and siblings of students already enrolled in the charter school.⁶

¹ Enrollment reflects ATS data from 10/31/13.

² NYC DOE Location Code Generation and Management System database.

³ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/12/14.

⁴ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/12/14.

⁵ Self-reported information given on 9/15/14.

⁶ Brooklyn Charter School's 2013-2014 application.

Part 2: Summary of Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the school an academic success?

Overview of School-Specific Data through 2012-2013

Students scoring at or above Level 3 on NYS assessments, compared to CSD, NYC, and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Brooklyn Charter School	29.6%	40.4%	61.5%	25.5%
CSD 14	44.0%	48.1%	51.8%	25.3%
Difference from CSD 14	-14.4	-7.7	9.7	0.2
NYC	46.1%	49.4%	51.2%	28.0%
Difference from NYC	-16.5	-9.0	10.3	-2.5
New York State	53.2%	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%
Difference from New York State	-23.6	-12.4	6.4	-5.6

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Brooklyn Charter School	50.0%	74.6%	88.5%	40.9%
CSD 14	54.9%	56.8%	61.8%	27.5%
Difference from CSD 14	-4.9	17.8	26.7	13.4
NYC	57.4%	60.0%	62.6%	32.7%
Difference from NYC	-7.4	14.6	25.9	8.2
New York State	61.0%	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%
Difference from New York State	-11.0	11.3	23.7	9.8

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself served.

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	D	A	A	C
Student Progress	D	A	A	C
Student Performance	D	C	A	B
School Environment	A	A	A	C
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	0.0	0.5	1.1	1.7

Progress Towards Attainment of Academic Goals

- Brooklyn Charter School, according to its 2012-2013 Annual Report to the New York State Education Department (NYSED), met three of 13 of its academic performance goals identified in its charter. Of the other ten goals, the school partially met one, did not meet eight, and one was not applicable because the 5th grade NYS Social Studies assessment is no longer administered.

Responsive Education Program & Learning Environment⁷

- Brooklyn Charter School focused on alignment of ELA and math curriculum to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) school-wide. The school reviewed its entire ELA and math Scope and Sequences, ensuring that all were aligned to CCLS.
- The school leadership team created a school-wide plan to support small group instruction.
- The school implemented a school-wide integrated technology web-communications portal, allowing enhanced student performance tracking and curriculum management.
- The school implemented an assessment schedule that includes interim assessments, unit assessments, and weekly assessments to generate data for reflective practices in classrooms.
- The school focused on closing the achievement gap by ensuring that specialized supports and interventions for students with disabilities and English Language Learners were put in place in classrooms.
- Brooklyn Charter School has a Response to Intervention (RTI) team that meets regularly to diagnose and prescribe next steps for students in need.
- To support struggling learners, the school added a homework help center available as part of after-school hours two days a week as well as a Saturday Academy of 17 sessions from October to April.
- The school utilizes the Marzano Model and Clinical Supervision in classroom observations and teacher evaluations to provide support for instructional improvement and teacher growth.
- The school's teaching teams engage in regular weekly meetings that focus on effective curriculum implementation, review of data, and next steps for student growth and achievement.
- The school developed a process for the design, review, and feedback around lesson plans in order to improve the overall quality of teaching and learning.

⁷ Self-reported information from school-submitted ACR self-evaluation form on 2/18/14.

Essential Question 2: Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

After reviewing information and documentation concerning Board turnover, Board minutes, reporting structure, organizational chart, annual accountability reporting documents, Board agendas, and the school's website, the NYC DOE notes the following:

- The Board has eight board members, five voting and three ex-officio members. The three ex-officio members include the head of school, a faculty representative, and a member on the education committee. The family representative on the Board is a voting member. The Board Chair, Henry Lambert, has been on the Board since July 2004.
- As evidenced from a review of Board rosters, two new members were added to the Board in January 2014, both ex-officio members. One member who had been with the Board for four years resigned on November 12, 2013. The family representative member also turned over during the 2013-2014 school year.
- As recorded in the Board's minutes, there is a clear reporting structure with school leadership providing regular updates on academic, financial, and operational performance to the Board and its committees.

School Climate & Community Engagement

After reviewing information and documentation concerning leadership turnover, staff turnover, attendance rate, student turnover, NYC School Survey results and response rates, and PTO meetings, the NYC DOE notes the following:

- The school experienced some leadership turnover with the addition of two new Assistant Principals; one was new to the school and one was promoted from 5th grade teacher. The Executive Director has been with the school since 2000 and the Principal joined the school at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year.
- Instructional staff turnover was 20% with four out of 30 instructional staff that chose not to return for the 2013-14 school year from the prior year and two instructional staff who were not asked to return. As of February 2014, during the 2013-14 school year, three teachers had left the school.⁸
- As of February 2014, average daily attendance for students during that school year was at 92%, which is lower than the school's charter goal of 95%.⁹
- Student turnover was 10.9% of students from the prior school year who did not return at the start of the 2013-2014 school year; 8.3% of the students left the school between the start of the school year and February 2014.¹⁰
- The school reported having a parent organization, called the Family Action Committee, as evidenced in the school's ACR self-evaluation and Board minutes.

2012-2013 NYC School Survey Results¹¹

Categories	Result	Community	Response Rate	Citywide Rate
Academic Expectations	Average	Parents	60%	54%
Communication	Average	Teachers	91%	83%
Engagement	Average	Students	N/A	83%
Safety & Respect	Average			

⁸ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/12/14.

⁹ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/12/14.

¹⁰ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/12/14.

¹¹ Results are particular to the school type as identified in the 2013 School Survey.

Financial Health

Near-term financial obligations:

- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's current ratio indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash to cover its operating expenses for at least nine months without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-14 budget to the actual enrollment at the end of the school year indicates that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY13 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations.

Financial sustainability based on current practices:

- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY13, the school generated an aggregate surplus over the three audited fiscal years, and in FY13 the school operated at a surplus.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY13, the school generated overall positive cash flow from FY11 to FY13 and the school had positive cash flow in each measurable year.

Annual Independent Financial Audit

- An independent audit performed for FY13 showed no material findings.

Essential Question 3: Compliance with charter and all applicable laws and regulations?

After a review of documentation submitted for the NYC DOE annual accountability reporting requirements for the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE finds the following:

Board Compliance

The Board is in compliance with:

- Currently, all officer positions outlined in the Board's bylaws are filled.
- The Board's membership size falls within the range of no fewer than five and no greater than 15 members, as outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws.

The Board is out of compliance with:

- The Board has not held the minimum number of Board meetings of at least 12, as outlined in its bylaws. Based on submitted Board minutes, the Board held eight meetings for the 2013-2014 school year in which quorum was reached.

School Compliance

The school is in compliance with (as reviewed during May 2014):

- All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.
- The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to NYC DOE.
- The school had an application deadline of April 4, 2014 and lottery date of April 10, 2014 adhering to the charter law's requirement of accepting applications up to at least April 1.

The school is out of compliance with:

- The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is not in compliance with state requirements for teacher certification with eight uncertified staff out of 35.
- The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is not in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization as of May 2014.
- The school leader was not trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC as of May 2014, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.
- The school has not posted its 2012-2013 NYSED Annual Report and annual audit to its website, as specified in charter law as of May 2014.

Essential Question 4: What are the school's plans for the next charter term?

As reported by the school's leadership, the following is noted:

- Brooklyn Charter School has no immediate plans for expansion, however, the school intends to submit a request for a material charter revision to increase its maximum authorized enrollment.
- The Board of Brooklyn Charter School has been reviewing the possibility of expanding the Board, in order to further build on the capacity of the Board members who have been with the Board for the last eight years.

Enrollment and Retention Targets

As a reminder regarding accountability in the next charter term:

- Amendments to Article 56 of the New York State Consolidated Laws: Education, which relates to Charter Schools, call for charter schools, as a consideration of renewal, "to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets" for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program. The amendments further indicate "Repeated failure to comply with the requirement" as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.
 - The law directs schools to demonstrate "that it has made extensive efforts to recruit and retain such students" in the event it has not yet met its targets.
 - The NYC DOE, as authorizer, will annually monitor the school's performance against these targets and the efforts it makes to meet this state requirement.
- In school year 2013-2014 (and the prior four years), Brooklyn Charter School served a higher percentage of students who qualified for free or reduced price lunch as compared to both CSD 14 and citywide averages. However, the school served lower percentages of students with disabilities and English Language Learner students compared to both CSD 14 and citywide averages.

Special Populations

	Free and Reduced Price Lunch					Students with Disabilities					English Language Learners				
	2009 -	2010 -	2011 -	2012 -	2013 -	2009 -	2010 -	2011 -	2012 -	2013 -	2009 -	2010 -	2011 -	2012 -	2013 -
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
School	64.2%	66.4%	83.5%	74.9%	78.7%	10.7%	10.5%	8.7%	7.8%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	4.3%
CSD 14	57.7%	60.7%	62.5%	65.8%	70.4%	17.4%	18.1%	17.6%	17.9%	18.8%	15.1%	14.4%	13.4%	12.4%	12.1%
NYC	62.1%	65.3%	68.1%	69.8%	73.5%	15.9%	15.9%	15.7%	16.1%	17.1%	16.1%	16.1%	15.5%	15.0%	14.7%

Additional Enrollment Information					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Grades Served	K-5	K-5	K-5	K-5	K-5
CSD(s)	14	14	14	14	14

Comparisons to both the CSD(s) and City are made against students in grades K-8, 9-12 or K-12 depending on the grades the school served in each school year. Special population figures are as of October 31 for each given school year, with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.